# VAPOR INRUSION DATA VALIDATION

EPA Region 5 Records Ctr. 361510

Sauget Area 2 Sauget, Illinois

Prepared for
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5
77W. Jackson Blvd. (SR-6J)
Chicago, IL 60604-3590

September 4, 2008



URS Corporation 1001 Highlands Plaza Drive West, Suite 300 St. Louis, MO 63110 (314) 429-0100 **Project #21561683** 

# VAPOR INRUSION DATA VALIDATION

Sauget Area 2 Sauget, Illinois

Prepared for
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5
77W. Jackson Blvd. (SR-6J)
Chicago, IL 60604-3590

September 4, 2008



URS Corporation 1001 Highlands Plaza Drive West, Suite 300 St. Louis, MO 63110 (314) 429-0100 Project #21561683

## **DISTRIBUTION LIST**

Leah Evison – 1 Hard Copy, 1 CD U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Superfund Division 77 West Jackson Blvd. (SR-6J) Chicago, IL 60604 312-886-6840

Sandra Bron – 2 Hard Copies, 2 CDs Illinois EPA
Bureau of Land, FSRS/NPL Unit
1021 North Grand Avenue East
P.O. Box 19276
Springfield, Illinois 62794-9276

Lisa Cundiff – 1 Hard Copies, 1 CDs CH2M HILL 727 North First Street Suite 400 St. Louis, MO 63102 314-421-0313 Sauget Area 2 Sites Group — Electronic

Steve Smith – 1 Hard Copies, 1 CDs Solutia 575 Maryville Centre Drive St. Louis, MO 63141

Table of Contents			
-------------------	--	--	--

.

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

GLOSSARY	OF ACRO	DNYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	<b>G</b> -1
SECTION 1	INTRO	DDUCTION	<b>1-</b> 1
	1.1	Project Description	1-1
	1.2	Overall Project Objectives	
SECTION 2	FIELD	ACTIVITIES	<b>2-</b> 1
	2.1	Quality Control Activities	2-1
		2.1.1 Document Review	2-1
		2.1.2 Equipment Decontamination	
		2.1.3 Sample Verification	2-1
		2.1.4 Field Equipment Calibration	
	2.2	Sample Collection Activities	
		2.2.1 Sample Containers, Handling, and Labeling	
		2.2.2 Documentation of Field Activities	
		2.2.3 Sample Designation	
		2.2.4 Field QA/QC Samples	2-3
SECTION 3	CHAIN	OF CUSTODIES	3-1
	3.1	Sample Documentation	3-1
SECTION 4	ANAL'	YTICAL PROCEDURES	4-1
	4.1	Laboratory Procedures	4-1
		4.1.1 Volatile Organics	
		4.1.2 Oxygen	4-1
	4.2	Laboratory QA/QC Samples	
		4.2.1 Method Blank	
•		4.2.2 Surrogate Spikes	
		4.2.3 Laboratory Control Samples	4-2
		4.2.4 Internal Standards Performance	4-2
SECTION 5	DATA	REVIEW/VALIDATION PROCESS	5-1
	5.1	Data Review/Validation Elements	5-1
		5.1.1 Completeness of Data Package	5-2
	•	5.1.2 Sample Preservation and Holding Times	
		5.1.3 Blanks	
		5.1.4 Surrogates	
		5.1.5 Laboratory Control Samples	
		5.1.6 Field Duplicate Samples	
		5.1.7 Instrument Performance Check (Data Validation Only)	
		5.1.8 Run Log Review (Data Validation Only)	
		5.1.9 Chromatogram Review (Data Validation Only)	
		5.1.10 Initial Calibration (Data Validation Only)	
		5.1.11 Calibration Verification (Data Validation Only)	5-5



# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	5.2	Measurement of Quality Assurance Objectives	5-6
		5.2.1 Precision	
		5.2.2 Accuracy	5-6
		5.2.3 Completeness	5-6
		5.2.4 Representativeness	5-7
		5.2.5 Comparability	5-7
		5.2.6 Sensitivity	5-7
	5.3	Data Assessment	5-8
		5.3.1 Summary of Data Quality Requirements	5-8
		5.3.2 Data Usability Assessment	5-9
SECTION 6	DATA	A REVIEW	6-1
	6.1	Data Quality Review Checklists for All SDGs	6-1
SECTION 7	DATA	A VALIDATION	7-1
	7.1	Introduction	7-1
	7.2	Level IV Validation Of Data	7-1
SECTION 8	DATA	A ASSESSMENT	8-1
	8.1	Overall Data Assessment	8-1
	8.2	Sampling Issues	
	8.3	Data Review/Validation Issues	
	8.4	Appropriateness	
	8.5	Limitations	
SECTION 9	REFE	ERENCES	9-1



# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

## **List of Tables**

Table 1-1	Summary of Collected Samples Sauget Area 2
Table 2-1	Summary of Field Duplicate Samples Sauget Area 2
Table 4-1	Data Review/Validation Qualifier Codes
Table 6-1	Summary of Qualifications for SDG 709432
Table 6-2	Summary of Qualifications for SDG 709494
Table 6-3	Summary of Qualifications for SDG 709528
Table 6-4	Summary of Qualifications for SDG 709557
Table 6-5	Summary of Qualifications for SDG 709576
Table 6-6	Summary of Qualifications for SDG 709608
Table 6-7	Summary of Qualifications for SDG 709647
Table 6-8	Summary of Qualifications for SDG 710035
Table 6-9	Summary of Qualifications for SDG 710142
Table 6-10	Summary of Qualifications for SDG 710169
Table 6-11	Summary of Qualifications for SDGs 709432 - 710169

## **List of Appendices**

Appendix A	Analytical Results
Appendix B	Copies of COCs

Level III Review and Level IV Validation Checklists Appendix C



# **GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

CV Calibration Verification CLP Contract Laboratory Program

CM Corrective Measures
COC Chain of Custody
DQO Data Quality Objective

GC/MS Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectrometry

ICV Initial Calibration Verification

ID Identification

IEPA Illinois Environmental Protection Agency

J Estimated Value

LCS Laboratory Control Sample MDL Method Detection Limit

MS/MSD Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate

ND Non-detect

%D Percent Difference %R Percent Recovery

%RSD Percent Relative Standard Deviation

PARCCS Precision, Accuracy, Representativeness, Completeness, Comparability

and Sensitivity

QA/QC Quality Assurance/Quality Control
QAPP Quality Assurance Project Plan
QCSR Quality Control Summary Report

r Correlation coefficient

R Rejected value
RF Response Factor
RL Reporting Limit

RPD Relative Percent Difference
SA2SG Sauget Area 2 Sites Group
SDG Sample Delivery Group
SIM Selected ion monitoring
SOP Standard Operating Procedure
TCD Thermal Conductivity Detection

U Non-detect Value (under the MDL)
UJ Estimated Non-detect (under the MDL)

URS URS Corporation

USACE U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

USEPA U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

VOCs Volatile Organic Compound

WP Work Plan



Section 1

The purpose of this investigation was to collect air samples to evaluate the soil gas vapor intrusion pathway as part of a Supplemental Investigation conducted at the Sauget Area 2 Sites in Illinois. This Validation Report discusses the laboratory analyses of air samples performed by Air Toxics LTD, of Folsom California. The field investigation was conducted by URS Corporation (URS). Field quality control activities such as sample verification that could have affected the data are also addressed. The data usability is assessed in this Report in support of additional data characterization for the site.

#### 1.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The existing soil data within the Sauget Area 2 Sites appears to be inadequate to use for a vapor intrusion evaluation. Based upon an evaluation of the potential alternatives to evaluate the vapor intrusion pathway, URS conducted a soil gas investigation in the vicinity of buildings near or within the boundaries of the Sauget Area 2 Sites. This investigation provided soil gas concentrations that were be used in the evaluation of vapor intrusion into buildings as part of the Human Health Risk Assessment for the Sauget Area 2 Sites. The investigation followed the procedures detailed in the Sauget Area I Soil Vapor Intrusion Investigation Work Plan, dated February 28, 2007. The samples collected as part of this investigation is listed in Table 1-1 of this report.

#### 1.2 **OVERALL PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

The objective of the sampling was to provide soil gas concentrations that were used in the evaluation of vapor intrusion into buildings as part of the Human Health Risk Assessment for the Sauget Area 2 Sites.



#### 2.1 QUALITY CONTROL ACTIVITIES

Document review activities took place prior to and concurrent with the field program implementation. Communication with the project manager clarified and confirmed the proposed sampling activities when conflicting information was encountered in the work plan document. The review and continuous communication assured that the samples collected during this program would meet prescribed project guidelines and satisfy the project data quality objectives (DQOs). Documentation of sampling activities and sample shipment chain-of-custody (COC) records were designed to confirm that all proposed investigation activities were completed as planned. Copies of the COC forms are presented in Appendix B of this report.

#### 2.1.1 **Document Review**

Prior to the startup of field activities, the Soil Gas Investigation WP, the Quality Assurance Project Plan (OAPP), and the Health and Safety Plan were provided to the members of the field sampling teams for their review. This familiarized them with the site being investigated, the objectives of the investigation, and the SOPs under which the field activities were to be completed. Field personnel were briefed on the work to be completed prior to project startup. Coordination of the field sampling activities was maintained through open communication among project management personnel, the field sampling teams, and the analytical laboratories.

#### 2.1.2 **Equipment Decontamination**

The equipment decontamination was completed by the laboratory. The 6 or 1-Liter Summa canisters were batch certified by the laboratory before being sent to the work site. Equipment decontamination was not required by the URS field personnel.

#### 2.1.3 **Sample Verification**

During field activities, the field sampling team reviewed the QAPP to verify the sample collection requirements for each sampling location. The review included the verification of target analytes, sample container requirements and the quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) sampling requirements. Information concerning the number and type of samples collected at each location was documented as identified in Section 2.2.2. Any questions or inconsistencies that arose during the field activities were directed to the URS Project Manager for resolution.

#### 2.1.4 **Field Equipment Calibration**

Field equipment did not require calibration.



#### 2.2 SAMPLE COLLECTION ACTIVITIES

Samples were collected for chemical analyses during the investigation in accordance with the field sampling procedures summarized in the Soil Gas Investigation WP. The samples were collected at the Sauget Area 2 Sites from September to October 2007. Table 1-1 of this Quality Summary Control Report (QSCR) summarizes the samples collected and includes sample identification, sampling date and time, sample matrix, and parameters analyzed for each sample.

Samples were submitted to Air Toxics, LTD in Folsom, California for all parameters.

#### 2.2.1 Sample Containers, Handling, and Labeling

The samples were collected in certified pre-cleaned Summa canisters, sealed, and affixed with a canister sample label in accordance with the Sample Handling Procedures listed in SOP No. 25 (Sample Containers, Preservation and Holding Times). Samples were placed the box provided by the laboratory, and sample custody was maintained until shipment to the laboratory. Sample labels included the sample identification number, and the sample collection date and time as specified in Section 5 of the QAPP.

Sample information, such as identification numbers, targeted analytes, sampling times, and QA/QC sample types, was documented on COC forms for shipment to the analytical laboratory. Completed COC forms were signed and one copy of the completed COC form was removed and retained for the field and office files. URS St. Louis put the Summa canisters in the box provided by the laboratory, sealed the box, and shipped them via overnight delivery service to Air Toxics, LTD.

The analytical laboratories and URS were in contact regularly regarding the number and type of samples shipped. These conversations also allowed for the expedient resolution of any questions or discrepancies arising from previous sample shipments.

#### 2.2.2 **Documentation of Field Activities**

Field logbooks were completed for the documentation of the field activities. All field activities and samples collected were documented in the field logbooks. Sample collection was also documented on the COCs.



#### 2.2.3 Sample Designation

Samples collected during the Supplemental Investigation were labeled with unique sample identification as summarized in Section 4 of the QAPP. There was no transcription errors associated with the samples collected.

#### 2.2.4 Field QA/QC Samples

OA/OC activities in the field included the collection of field blanks and duplicate sample pairs. The following sections detail the field QA/QC samples collected.

#### 2.2.4.1 Field Duplicate Samples

Field duplicate samples were collected and submitted for analysis at an approximate ten percent frequency. Field duplicates were collected following the same procedures as the original samples. The field duplicates were submitted to Air Toxics, LTD as routine analytical samples.

Field duplicate results provided estimates for overall precision of sample collection, field sample preparation, and laboratory analysis. The duplicate sample data was used to assess the usability of the sample data. Field duplicates are identified in Table 2-1. The results of the field duplicate samples are discussed in the data reviews summarized in Appendix C of this Validation Report.

### Field Blanks

Field blanks were collected and submitted to the laboratory with the investigative samples and analyzed for the same parameters as the investigative samples. Field blanks were collected from a certified air source in the field. Field blanks were analyzed to check for procedural contamination at the site which may have caused sample contamination.



#### 3.1 SAMPLE DOCUMENTATION

Documentation of sample tracking is an important aspect of environmental investigations and is designed to maintain the sample integrity subsequent to sample collection.

The URS field crews were responsible for completing COC forms which described the sample identification, time of collection, sample matrix, analyses requested, preservatives (if required), and any additional comments. The COCs were placed in the boxes shipped to the laboratory. Upon receipt of the boxes, the laboratory reviewed each box and accompanying COCs. Copies of the completed COCs are presented in Appendix B.

The laboratory sent URS sample confirmations via e-mail. Some minor discrepancies were noted during the sample receipt. These issues were addressed immediately with the field manager and were corrected prior to the submittal of the data package. URS was contacted regarding an anomaly for samples received September 24, 2007. The "relinquished by" portion of the COC was not signed by URS before samples were shipped to the laboratory. All samples were received by the laboratory in good condition. No additional problems or discrepancies were noted. All issues listed above were resolved prior to analysis and did not impact project DQOs.



#### 4.1 LABORATORY PROCEDURES

The samples collected during the Supplemental Investigation were analyzed following USEPA methods as summarized below. The associated QC review and data validation summaries are provided in Appendix C, respectively. The laboratory provided, in various batches, documentation for the methods listed below, including sample preparation, sample tracking, and documentation controls.

The data reported by the laboratory were reviewed and qualified accordingly. The qualifiers assigned are listed in Table 4-1.

#### 4.1.1 **Volatile Organics**

VOC soil gas analysis was prepared and analyzed by USEPA Methods TO-15 and TO-15 selected ion monitoring (SIM). Method TO-15 utilizes gas chromatography/mass spectrometry (GC/MS) for separation and detection, respectively.

#### 4.1.2 Oxygen

Modified ASTM Method D1946 is a gas chromatography/thermal conductivity detection (GC/TCD) method that was used for determining the chemical composition of reformed gases and gaseous mixtures. Samples were prepared and analyzed by following Modified ASTM Method D1946.

#### 4.2 LABORATORY QA/QC SAMPLES

#### 4.2.1 **Method Blank**

The method blank for the analysis consisted of is an unused, certified canister that has not left the laboratory. The blank canister was pressurized with humidified, ultra-pure zero air and carried through the same analytical procedure as the field sample. The blank was carried through each step of the analytical method to analysis. The method blank data were used to evaluate potential contamination contributed to sample preparation and analysis during normal laboratory operations.

#### 4.2.2 **Surrogate Spikes**

Surrogate spikes are compounds added to every blank, sample, laboratory control sample, and standard when specified in the analytical methodology. The results are utilized to evaluate the accuracy of analytical measurements on a sample-specific basis. Surrogates are generally brominated, fluorinated, or isotopically labeled compounds not expected to be present in



environmental media. Results are expressed as percent recovery (%R) of the surrogate spike. Recoveries outside of criteria can indicate evidence of matrix interference or problems with internal standards.

#### 4.2.3 **Laboratory Control Samples**

Laboratory control samples (LCS) are well-characterized, laboratory-generated samples and are used to monitor the laboratory's day-to-day performance of analytical methods. The organics LCS limits are based on ± three sigma and are updated every six months. LCSs are used to monitor the precision and accuracy of the analytical process independent of matrix effects. In some instances, the LCS is used to identify any background interference or contamination of the analytical system, which may lead to the reporting of elevated concentration levels or false positive results. The results of the LCS are compared to well-defined evaluation criteria to determine whether the laboratory system is "in control." Controlling laboratory operations with LCS, rather than surrogates or matrix spike/matrix spike duplicate (MS/MSD), offers the advantage of being able to differentiate low recoveries due to procedural errors from those due to matrix effects.

#### 5.2.3 **Internal Standards Performance**

Internal standards, which are compounds not found in environmental samples, are spiked into blanks, samples, and LCSs. The internal standards are spiked into the GC trap at the collection time. Internal standards are used as a reference for calibration and for controlling the precision and bias of the analytical method. Internal standards must meet retention time and performance criteria specified in the analytical method or the sample would have been reanalyzed.



Section 5

The data review process, which involved a review of the laboratory summary data, was implemented to assess the quality of data resulting from the field sampling program with respect to the quality assurance objectives established for the project. In order to evaluate the appropriate usage of the data, in supporting decisions to be made, the data was evaluated with respect to data quality, major data uses, and the remedial decision to be made. Data that did not meet the criteria were qualified or discussed for the limitation on usability. In addition, approximately 10 percent of the data underwent a more comprehensive evaluation which included the review of raw data (i.e., chromatograms, run logs, etc.), recalculation of data, and sample tracking. For the purpose of this document, this extended review was termed full validation.

The following sections summarize the data review and data validation approach used for the Sauget A2 samples. In general, the review and validation followed guidance as presented in USEPA Contract Laboratory Program (CLP) National Functional Guidelines for Organic Data Review (USEPA 1999), as applicable to USEPA analytical methods and method-specific criteria. As indicated above, the data review involved reviewing QC summary forms, whereas the validation additionally involved the review of raw data. Table 3.1 of the Sauget A2 OAPP (URS 2004) summarizes the data review/validation criteria in tabular format.

#### 5.1 DATA REVIEW/VALIDATION ELEMENTS

Analytical laboratory results were reviewed following guidance presented in USEPA CLP National Functional Guidelines for Organic Data Review (USEPA 1999). The data were reviewed/validated using the QC criteria specified in the Sauget A2 QAPP (URS 2004). These guidelines were used as applicable to USEPA methods. Method-specific and established laboratory criteria were used for data assessment. Based on results of the data review/validation processes, sample data may have been qualified as J (estimated), UJ (estimated non-detect), or U (non-detect).

Although the data packages provided were not CLP deliverables, the CLP guidance was followed where applicable to USEPA methodology. The QC elements reviewed in laboratory analytical data packages included the following:

- Completeness of the data package
- Laboratory case narrative and log-in receipt forms
- Compliance with required holding times



- Presence of analytes in method blanks and field blanks
- Results of LCS
- Recoveries of surrogate spikes in samples
- Recoveries of internal standards
- Field duplicate samples
- Laboratory duplicate samples

The data validation included all of the items identified above and additionally included the items below:

- Instrument performance check samples
- Run logs review
- Chromatograms review
- Initial calibration
- Calibration verifications (CV)
- Retention time windows
- Analytical result verification

When a result was above the method detection limit (MDL) and below the reporting limit, the laboratory flagged data J to indicate that the concentration reported is an estimated value. The data, including all post-analysis qualifiers, are presented in the data summary tables in Appendix A. The data review and validation results are presented in Appendix C.

The data review and validation procedures used to evaluate the Sauget A2 data are described in this section. The QC review details quality control issues associated with the analysis of the samples, describes if the data required qualification.

#### 5.1.1 Completeness of Data Package

Data packages were reviewed to make certain that they contained the data contractually required in the deliverable. This included checking the data package for the results of each analyte requested on each field sample submitted in the analytical batch, along with the requested QC documentation for the respective methods.



#### 5.2.4 Sample Preservation and Holding Times

Sample holding times were calculated by subtracting the date of sampling, as determined from the COC forms, from the date of sample analysis. If the sample analysis was completed outside of the required holding times, data was qualified as estimated J (detects) or UJ (nondetects), or rejected **R**, depending on the severity of the exceeded holding time. The validation additionally included reviewing run logs and chromatograms to ensure the dates presented on the summary forms were accurate.

#### 5.1.3 **Blanks**

Guidance provided in the USEPA CLP National Functional Guidelines for Organic Review was used for the evaluation of method blanks and field blanks. If analytes were detected in a blank sample, but not in samples associated with the blank sample, then data was not qualified. If analytes were reported in a blank and in associated samples, the following actions were taken:

- Positive sample results were reported without qualification when the concentration of the analyte in the sample exceeded 10 times (10x) the amount in a blank for common laboratory contaminants (methylene chloride, acetone, 2-butanone), or exceeded 5 times (5x) the amount in a blank for other compounds. Note: The 10x rule was only applied to method blank samples.
- When the sample results were greater than the reporting limit (RL), but less than the required multiple (5x or 10x) of the method blank result, sample results were qualified as non-detect U, and the RL was raised to the sample concentration.
- When the sample results were less than the RLs and less than the required multiple of the method blank result, sample results were qualified as non-detect U at the RL.

During the data validation, the chromatograms were reviewed to ensure all peaks were identified and explained. In addition, run logs were reviewed to ensure a method or preparation blank was analyzed with each batch.

#### 5.1.4 **Surrogates**

Surrogates were used to assess accuracy for TO-15 and TO-15 SIM, analyses on a sample specific basis. Criteria for recovery of surrogate compounds spiked into samples are provided in Table 3.3 of the QAPP (URS 2004). For TO-15 and TO-15 SIM analyses, if any surrogate was out of specification due to recoveries greater than the upper evaluation limit, indicating a high bias, positive results for that sample were qualified as estimated J, and non-detect data were not qualified. If recoveries were below the lower evaluation limit, indicating a low bias, but greater



than 10 percent, positive results for that sample were qualified as estimated J, and non-detect results were qualified as estimated UJ. For any surrogate recovery below 10 percent, positive results for that sample were qualified as estimated J, and non-detect results were qualified as rejected R.

The validation additionally included recalculating the surrogate values from the raw data and reviewing the chromatograms to ensure the surrogate compounds were within the established retention time windows.

#### 5.1.5 **Laboratory Control Samples**

LCS is well characterized, laboratory-generated samples used to monitor the laboratory's day-today performance for organic analyses, and to assess the accuracy and precision of the analytical process independent of matrix effects. Evaluation criteria for LCS are provided in Appendix A of the QAPP (URS 2004). Sample results associated with a LCS recovery below the evaluation limit were qualified as estimated J (detects) or UJ (nondetects) based on a potential low bias. If LCS recoveries were less than half the lower evaluation limit, sample results reported as nondetect were qualified rejected R. Detected sample results associated with a LCS recovery above the evaluation limit were qualified as estimated J based on a potential high bias. Data reported as non-detect were not qualified based on a LCS with potential high bias.

The validation additionally included reviewing extraction and run logs to ensure a LCS was analyzed with each batch. Approximately 10 percent of the LCS recoveries were recalculated using the raw data. In addition, chromatograms were reviewed to ensure the LCS compounds were within the retention time windows.

#### 5.1.6 **Field Duplicate Samples**

Field duplicate samples were collected at a frequency of approximately 10 percent, as required by the Sauget A2 QAPP (URS 2004). Relative percent differences (RPDs) were calculated for each field duplicate pair. Precision evaluation criteria of 25 percent RPD for soil gas samples were considered if the analyte concentrations were greater than 5x the RL for both samples. For analytical results less than 5x the RL, for either or both samples, RPD evaluation criteria of  $\pm 2x$ the RL were utilized. Duplicate results were evaluated on a case-by-case basis to determine if qualification of data was necessary. Where it was determined that qualification of field duplicate samples was required, associated data were qualified J (detects) or UJ (nondetects).



#### 5.1.7 Instrument Performance Check (Data Validation Only)

The laboratory was required to analyze an instrument performance check sample every 12 hours of sample analysis. The instrument performance check sample summaries were compared to the method criteria. In addition, approximately 20 percent of the values were recalculated from the raw data. The laboratory was required to meet the method criteria prior to analyzing samples. If the laboratory did not meet the tuning criteria, the associated samples were qualified as **R**.

#### 5.1.8 **Run Log Review (Data Validation Only)**

Review of the run logs involved reviewing the logs to determine that samples were analyzed as presented on the sample summary forms. The sample run logs were reviewed to determine that the correct sample volume was prepared, the appropriate QC samples (e.g., LCS...) were analyzed as part of the analytical batch, and the samples were analyzed in the method-required order.

#### 5.1.9 **Chromatogram Review (Data Validation Only)**

This involved a review of each chromatogram to determine that peaks were within the acceptable retention time windows of the associated standard. The review also included comparing the analysis times presented on the instrument run logs to those presented on the sample chromatograms. In addition, the review identified all peaks present on the chromatogram as either: target analytes, internal standards, surrogates, or tentatively identified compounds.

### 5.1.10 Initial Calibration (Data Validation Only)

Each method required establishing an initial calibration curve. The data validation involved reviewing the percent relative standard deviations (%RSDs), the response factors (RFs) or the correlation coefficient ® if linear regression was employed. If %RSDs, RFs, or correlation coefficient ® were not met for an analyte, the associated data was qualified as J, UJ, or R, depending on the severity of the outlying data point. One analyte per internal standard was recalculated using the raw data.

## 5.1.11 Calibration Verification (Data Validation Only)

Each method required the analysis of CV samples to ensure the initial calibration was still valid. The data validation involved reviewing the percent difference (%D) of the RFs between the CV and the associated calibration curve. If the RF or %D criteria were not met for an analyte, the associated data was qualified as J, UJ, or R, depending on the severity of the outlying data. One



analyte per internal standard, or 10 percent of the data presented on the continuing calibration summary forms, were recalculated using the raw data.

#### 5.2 **MEASUREMENT OF QUALITY ASSURANCE OBJECTIVES**

The measurement of quality assurance was determined by the assessment of precision, accuracy, representativeness, completeness, comparability, and sensitivity (PARCCS). The PARCCS definitions are included below and the PARCCS assessments are included in Section 8.

#### 5.2.1 **Precision**

Precision is the measure of variability between individual sample measurements under prescribed conditions. Replicate measurements of known standards and the analysis of duplicate environmental samples assess precision. Evaluating the RPDs obtained from results of laboratory duplicate, and field duplicate samples assessed precision. The precision of the data is discussed in Section 8.

#### 5.2.5 Accuracy

Accuracy is the degree of agreement between the measurement of a known sample and an accepted reference or true value. Evaluating %Rs for LCS samples, and surrogates assessed accuracy. The accuracy of the data is discussed in Section 8.

#### 5.2.6 Completeness

Following the QC review and validation of the data packages for the site, the data were assessed with respect to the fulfillment of QA objectives and usability. The completeness for laboratory analytical data for the site was calculated by the ratio of acceptable (including estimated data) analyses requested on the samples submitted for analysis, to the total number of analytical results requested.

$$%Complete = \frac{Number\ of\ Valid\ Analytical\ Results (including\ estimated\ J\ results)}{Total\ Number\ of\ Analytical\ Results\ Requested}$$

The percent completeness, with respect to overall project objectives for the Sauget A2 project, was evaluated for the data required in making decisions on a case-by-case basis. In general, samples critical to the decision process required a 95 percent completeness goal.



#### 5.2.4 Representativeness

Representativeness is the degree to which data accurately and precisely represents a characteristic of a population, parameter variations at a sampling point, or an environmental condition. Representativeness is a parameter primarily concerned with the proper design of the sampling program (such as sampling location strategy) or sub-sampling of a given sample. Assessment of representativeness includes an evaluation of precision. Therefore, reviewing the precision of field duplicate samples collected from a site can assess representativeness of the analytical results, with respect to the medium sampled. Review criteria for field duplicate analyses are identified in Section 5.1.7.

#### 5.2.5 Comparability

Comparability expresses qualitatively the confidence with which one data set can be compared to another. Data are comparable when collection techniques, measurement procedures, methods, and reporting are equivalent for all samples within the sample set. Section 8 contains a qualitative assessment of data comparability.

#### 5.3.1 Sensitivity

Sensitivity broadly describes the RL established to meet the project-specific DOOs. The sample RL is the lowest concentration of an analyte present in a sample that can be quantified with a specified level of confidence. The RLs are a function of the sample characteristics, MDLs, and laboratory performance.

MDLs are determined by the laboratory and defined as the level at which the laboratory can reliably quantify the concentration of an analyte on multiple analyses. The RLs are greater than the MDLs because MDL studies are performed using laboratory-prepared samples (spiked zero air); whereas, environmental samples are naturally more variable. United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) requires that RLs are 3-5 times the MDL. MDLs and RLs are provided in Tables 1.4B through 1.4D of the Sauget A2 QAPP (URS 2004). For this project, data are reported below the RLs as estimated J. Factors that may result in elevated RLs are discussed below.

 High concentrations of target or non-target analytes may require that the sample extract be diluted to avoid saturation of the detector, or to quantify the analyte concentration within the calibration range of the instrument. Consequently, RLs are elevated in proportion to the dilution factor.



- Matrix interference may require that the sample be diluted to reduce or eliminate the interference. Consequently, the RLs are elevated in proportion to the dilution factor.
- The physical characteristics of the matrix do not permit concentration to the required final volume during sample preparation, resulting in a larger sample extract volume and, consequently, an elevation in RLs.
- Matrix interference may require the RLs be elevated because of the inability to quantify data below the elevated RL.

In a given sample, one or more of these effects may be exhibited. When the RLs have been elevated as a result of one or more of the above causes, surrogate or target compounds present at low concentrations may not be detected. Therefore, elevated RLs may cause limitations to the application of the data for its intended use. These limitations on data for contaminants of concern are discussed on a case-by-case basis.

#### 5.3.2 DATA ASSESSMENT

The assessment of data involves the consideration of data uses, the identification of data which were qualified or otherwise deviated from the Sauget A2 QAPP requirements, and the limitations associated with the evaluation of data in supporting decisions to be made.

#### 5.3.3 **Summary of Data Quality Requirements**

Data collected in the corrective measures (CM) must be of known quality to support the uses for which it is intended. Data must meet the minimum quality standards to be useful in assessing the chemicals of concern, if any were released from the site, the acceptable level of uncertainty, and the concentrations in environmental media of concern at potential exposure points. Additionally, RLs must meet the levels necessary to determine whether analytes are present at concentrations of concern (i.e., above relative background concentrations, regulatory standards, or risk-based concentrations).

Inherent in providing defensible data is the need for a QA/QC program. The QA/QC program must have measurement tools so that data collected will be of known quality and legally defensible. QA/QC objectives for sampling and analysis were developed for this project which uses the following as indicators: precision, accuracy, completeness, comparability, representativeness, and sensitivity.



#### 5.3.4 **Data Usability Assessment**

A determination of data usability was made with respect to project DQOs. Sampling issues and data review/validation issues were discussed in terms of appropriateness of using the data as intended, as well as making recommendations or limitations on data usage. These discussions address items such as elevated RLs, analytes suspected as laboratory contaminants, potential bias in results, and professional judgment utilized in the data review/validation. The data assessment summary is provided in Section 8 of this QCSR.



Section 6

The A2 sampling activities from September, 2007 to October, 2007 resulted in the collection of 32 soil gas samples, 3 field duplicate samples and 4 field blank samples. The sample results were submitted in multiple SDGs and are noted 709432 through 710169. The samples were identified for the following parameters VOCs by TO-15, TO-15 SIM and Oxygen. All samples were sent to Air Toxics, LTD in Folsom, CA.

Appendix C contains the data quality reviews for all samples. The data quality reviews have been organized by sample delivery group (SDG).

#### 6.1 DATA QUALITY REVIEW CHECKLISTS FOR ALL SDGS

SDGs were reviewed for each parameter separately. Appendix C contains the detailed review checklists for each parameter. In addition, a list of qualifiers for each SDG is provided at the end of the subsequent checklists for that SDG.



Section 7

#### 7.1 INTRODUCTION

Appendix C summarizes the full validation reports for ten percent of the chemical data for samples collected during the 2007 Sauget A2 field effort. The validation was completed in accordance with USEPA CLP National Functional Guidelines for Organic Data Review (USEPA 1999), where applicable to USEPA Methods. Additionally, QA/QC criteria established in the QAPP (URS 2004) was used.

#### **LEVEL IV VALIDATION OF DATA** 7.2

SDGs were validated at a rate of ten percent for each parameter. Appendix C contains the detailed validation checklists from each parameter.



Section 8

#### 8.1 **OVERALL DATA ASSESSMENT**

Ouality issues for the data were assessed to evaluate their affect on the major data uses. In general, the objective of the sampling event was to gather data sufficient to evaluate data usability in support of the Supplemental Investigation.

Based on the criteria outlined, all data have met the DQOs and should be accepted for their intended use.

Overall accuracy and precision, assessed by the analysis of LCS and surrogate compounds, was approximately 99.5 percent. Representativeness, assessed by the analysis of field blank samples and field duplicate samples was also acceptable. One hundred percent of the field duplicate results were within criteria. Completeness, defined as the percentage of usable data (data not qualified as R), was approximately 100 percent. Comparability was acceptable as samples were analyzed using the standard operating procedures throughout the project duration. Therefore, the overall PARCC parameters were acceptable. Sensitivity, and its impact on data usability, is included in the report.

#### 8.2 **SAMPLING ISSUES**

No sampling issues impacted data quality. Section 3 summarizes issues and documents that impact to the project DQO's.

#### 8.3 **DATA REVIEW/VALIDATION ISSUES**

For laboratory analytical data, QA objectives were specified in the Sauget A2 QAPP (URS 2004). The OA objectives were used as indicators of the quality of data necessary to support identification and quantification of potential chemicals of concern. The data was reviewed and validated as identified in the QAPP (URS 2004). While the data review assessed the data based on the QC summary forms, the data validation was completed to determine if a more extensive review of the data indicated noncompliance with the method SOPs.

As presented in Appendix C, analytical results for some samples were qualified as UJ or J to indicate the quality control associated with that data did not meet evaluation criteria; however, they could be used for decision-making purposes. Analytical results were also qualified as U due to field blank contamination. Appendix C summarizes all qualifications based on Data Quality Reviews and all qualifications based on Data Quality Validations.



#### 8.4 **APPROPRIATENESS**

Analytical methodologies identified in Section 4 were utilized to help determine the presence of any chemicals of concern. With respect to the site description, the analytical methods utilized were appropriate to assess all chemicals of concern.

#### 8.5 **LIMITATIONS**

Limitations occur when reporting limits have been elevated above the decision point, or data were detected below reporting limits (resulting in estimated data). The summary of analytical data presented in Appendix A identifies the reporting limits for each sample analysis, and the qualifications associated with the data. No limitations were identified. Table 6-11 summarizes all qualifications to the data based on the data review and validation procedures.



**SECTIONNINE** 

- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2005. Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste Physical/Chemical Methods. SW846. Third Edition. Final Update IIIB.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 1999. National Functional Guidelines for Organic Data Review. USEPA Contract Laboratory Program. EPA 540/R-9/008. October.





TABLE 1-1
Summary of Collected Samples Sauget Area 2

SDG	Sample ID	Sample Date	Sample Time	Matrix	VOCs (T0-15)	VOC (TO-15 SIM)	Oxygen (Modified ASTM D-1946)
709432	VI-2-B	9/19/07	929	Soil gas	х	х	Х
709432	VI-091907-FB	9/19/07	1042	Soil gas	х	х	х
709432	VI-2-D	9/19/07	1505	Soil gas	х	х	х
709494	VI-4-A	9/21/07	838	Soil gas	х	х	х
709494	VI-4-B	9/21/07	1007	Soil gas	х	х	х
709494	VI-092107-FB	9/21/07	1022	Soil gas	х	х	х
709494	VI-3-A	9/21/07	1412 -	Soil gas	х	х	х
709528	VI-3-B	9/24/07	846	Soil gas	х	х	
709528	VI-3-C	9/24/07	938	Soil gas	х	х	
709528	VI-4-C	9/24/07	. 1210	Soil gas	х	х	
709528	VI-4-C DUP	9/24/07	1210	Soil gas	х	Х	
709528	VI-4-D	9/24/07	1309	Soil gas	x	х	
709528	VJ-4-E	9/24/07	1524	Soil gas	х	х	
709557	VI-5-A	9/25/07	831	Soil gas	х	х	
709557	VI-5-B	9/25/07	924	Soil gas	х	х	
709557	VI-5-C	9/25/07	1204	Soil gas	х	х	
709557	VI-092507-FB	9/25/07	1344	Soil gas	х	х	
709576	VI-10-A	9/2/07	823	Soil gas	х	х	х
709576	VI-6-A	9/26/07	1147	Soil gas	х	х	х
709576	VI-12-4	9/26/07	1514	Soil gas	Х	х	х
709608	VI-10-D	9/27/07	1026	Soil gas	х	х	х
709647	VI-11-A	9/28/07	939	Soil gas	Х	х	х
709647	VI-11-A DUP	9/28/07	939	Soil gas	х	Х	х
709647	VI-13-A	9/28/07	1241	Soil gas	х	х	х
709647	VI-092807-FB	9/28/07	1312	Soil gas	Х	х	х
710035	VI-10-B1	10/1/07	1027	Soil gas	х		Щ.
710035	VI-10-C1	10/1/07	1002	Soil gas	х		
710035	VI-6-B1	10/1/07	1320	Soil gas	х		
710035	VI-6-CI	10/1/07	1401	Soil gas	х		
710142	VI-9-A	10/3/07	824	Soil gas	х	х	х
710142	VI-9-B	10/3/07	856	Soil gas	х	X	х
710142	VI-9-C	10/3/07	1058	Soil gas	х	х	х
710142	VI-8-C	10/3/07	1601	Soil gas	х	х	X
710169	VI-7-A	10/2/07	908	Soil gas	х	х	X
710169	VI-7-B	10/2/07	932	Soil gas	х	х	X
710169	VI-7-C	10/2/07	1144	Soil gas	Х	Х	Х
710169	VI-7-C DUP	10/2/07	1144	Soil gas	X	х	х
710169	VI-7-D	10/2/07	1214	Soil gas	х	Х	х
710169	VI-8-A	10/2/07	1435	Soil gas	x	х	Х

TAL\_& 2-1

# **Summary of Field Duplicate Samples Sauget Area 2**

SDG	Sample ID	Sample Date	Sample Time	Matrix	VOCs (TO-15)	VOC (TO-15 SIM)	Oxygen (Modified ASTM D-1946)
	<u> </u>		1	1.2401110	<u> </u>		
709528	VI-4-C	9/24/07	1210	Soil gas	x	X	<u> </u>
709528 709528					T		
	VI-4-C	9/24/07	1210	Soil gas	х	х	x
709528	VI-4-C VI-4-C DUP	9/24/07 9/24/07	1210 1210	Soil gas Soil gas	X X	X X	
709528 709647	VI-4-C VI-4-C DUP VI-11-A	9/24/07 9/24/07 9/28/07	1210 1210 939	Soil gas Soil gas Soil gas	x x x	X X X	х

TABLE 4-1

#### **Data Review/Validation Qualifier Codes**

	GC/MS Organics		GC and HPEC Organics	Fig. 3	Inorganics and Conventionals
	Interpretation	Code	Interpretation	Code	Interpretation
a	Incorrect or incomplete analytical sequence	a	Incorrect or incomplete analytical sequence	a	Incorrect or incomplete analytical sequence
C.	Calibration failure; poor (RRF) or unstable (%D) response	<b>b</b> %	Instrument performance failure or poor chromatography	¢c.	Calibration failure
ď	MS/MSD or LCS/LCSD RPD imprecision	C∵	Calibration failure; poor or unstable (%D) response	* å ¥	MSIMSD or LCSILCSD RPD imprecision
è	Sample preservation or cooler temperature failure	ď	MS/MSD or LCS/LCSD RPD imprecision	∓ e "	Sample preservatmon or cooler temperature failure
	Field duplicate imprecision	e	Sample preservation or cooler temperature failure		Field duplicate imprecision
80000000000	Holding time violation	i i	Field duplicate imprecision	3 h	Holding time violation
	Tuning Failure or poor mass spectrometer performance	g	Dual column confirmation imprecision	k	Laboratory duplicate imprecision
	LCS recovery failure	ab.	Holding time violation	M.	LCS recovery failure
× m	MS/MSD recovery failure		LCS recovery failure	m	MS/MSD recovery failure
,ne	Internal standard failure	m	MS/MSD recovery failure	L D	ICP interference check sample failure
P.	Air bubble (> 6 mm or ¼ inch) in VOC vials	<b>.</b> p.,	Air bubble (>6 mm or 1/4 inch) in VOC vials	o'	Calibration blank contamination
q	Concentration exceeded the linear range	g.	Concentration exceeded the linear range	P	Preparation blank contamination
	linearity (%RSD or r) failure in initial calibration	ŗ	Lincarity (%RSD or r) failure in initial calibration	q	Concentration exceeded the linear range
S-8 %	Surrogate failure	9	Surrogate failure	r	Linearity failure in calibration or MSA
	Tentatively identified Compound	u.	No confirmation column	72.5°	Serial dilution failure
W	Identification criteria failure	w	Identification criteria failure	17. V	Post-digestion spike failure
1,327,317,375,4	Field and/or equipment blank contamination	X	Field and/or equipment blank contamination	( w)	CRDL standard recovery failure
ŷy.	Trip blank contamination	, y.,	Trip blank contamination	S X	Field and/or equipment blank contamination
32	Method blank and/or storage blank contamination	Z	Method blank and/or storage blank contamination	2	Laboratory storage blank contamination
Q	Other — see bottom of data report for explanation	, Q	Other — see bottom of data report for explanation	Q.	Other - see bottom of data report for explanation

The reason code indicates the type of quality control failure that lead to the application of the data validation flag.

**TABLE 6-1** 

# $Summary\ of\ Qualifications\ for\ SDG\ 709432$

SDG	Sample ID	Analysis	Analyte	URS Qual.	Code	New RL
709432	VI-2-D	TO-15	4-Ethyltoluene	U	X	- 1
709432	VI-2-B	TO-15	2-Butanone	U	X	-
709432	VI-2-B	TO-15	Benzene	υ	X	- "

Notes

Dashed lines indicate a new RL was not required

U = Non-detect

X = Field Blank Contamination

**TABLE 6-2** 

## **Summary of Qualifications for SDG 709494**

SDG	Sample ID	Analysis	Analyte	URS Qual.	Code	New RL
709494	VI-4-A	TO-15	Freon 12	UJ	L	-
709494	VI-4-B	TO-15	Freon 12	UJ	L	-
709494	VJ-3-A	TO-15	Freon 12	J	L	-

Notes

Dashed lines indicate a new RL was not required

J = Estimated

L = Low LCS Recovery

UJ = Estimated non-detect

**TABLE 6-3** 

## **Summary of Qualifications for SDG 709528**

SDG	Sample ID	Analysis	Analyte	URS Qual.	Code	New RL
709528	VI-3-B	TO-15	Freon 12	J	L	
709528	VI-3-C	TO-15	Freon 12	UJ	L	-
709528	VI-4-C	TO-15	Freon 12	J	L	-
709528	VI-4-C DUP	TO-15	Freon 12	j	L	-
709528	VI-4-D	TO-15	Freon 12	UJ	L	-
709528	VI-4-E	TO-15	Freon 12	UJ	L	-

Notes:

Dashed lines indicate a new RL was not required

J = Estimated

L = Low LCS Recovery

UJ = Estimated non-detect

TABLE 6-4
Summary of Qualifications for SDG 709557

SDG	Sample ID	Analysis	Analyte	URS Qual.	Code	New RL
709557	VI-5-A	TO-15	m,p-Xylene	U	Х	- "
709557	VI-5-A	TO-15	4-Ethyltoluene	U	X	-
709557	VI-5-B	TO-15	2-Butanone	U	X	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	2-Butanone	U	X	_
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	m,p-Xylene	U	X	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	o-Xylene	U	X	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	4-Ethyltoluene	Ü	X	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	U	Х	1
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Freon 114	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Chloroethane	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Ethanol	J	S	
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Acetone	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Methyl tert-butyl ether	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Hexane	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	1,1-Dichloroethane	J	S	,
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Cyclohexane	J	S	
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Heptane	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Toluene	J	S	
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Tetrachloroethane	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15 SIM	Trichloroethene	J	S	-

#### Notes

Dashed lines indicate a new RL was not required

J = Estimated

S = High Surrogate Recovery

U = Non-detect

X = Field Blank Contamination

**TABLE 6-5** 

#### **Summary of Qualifications for SDG 709576**

SDG	Sample ID	Analysis	Analyte	URS Qual.	Code	New RL
709576	VI-12-A	TO-15	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	J	С	
709576	VI-10-A	TO-15	alpha-Chlorotoluene	UJ	С	-
709576	VI-10-A	TO-15	Methyl tert-butyl ether	UJ	С	-
709576	VI-6-A	TO-15	alpha-Chlorotoluene	UJ	С	-
709576	VI-6-A	TO-15	Methyl tert-butyl ether	UJ	С	-
709576	VI-12-A	TO-15	Ethanol	UJ	· C	-
709576	VI-12-A	TO-15	Methyl tert-butyl ether	UJ	С	-
709576	VI-10-A	TO-15	2-Butanone	J	С	
709576	VI-6-A	TO-15	2-Butanone	UJ	С	-

#### Notes

Dashed lines indicate a new RL was not required

C = Initial or continuing calibration %D or %RSD outside evaluation criteria

J = Estimated

UJ = Estimated non-detect

	SDG	Sample ID	Analysis	Analyte	URS Qual.	Code	New RL
1	709608	No Qualifications		•			

**TABLE 6-7** 

## **Summary of Qualifications for SDG 709647**

SDG	Sample ID	Analysis	Analyte	URS Qual.	Code	New RL
709647	VI-11-A	TO-15	Acetone	U	X	
709647	VI-11-A	TO-15	2-Butanone	U	Χ	-
709647	VI-11-A	TO-15	m,p -Xylene	U	Х	-
709647	VI-13-A	TO-15	2-Butanone	U	X	-
709647	VI-13-A	TO-15	Benzene	U	X	-
709647	VI-13-A	TO-15	m,p -Xylene	U	Χ	-

Notes:

Dashed lines indicate a new RL was not required

U = Non-detect

X = Field Blank Contamination

SDG	Sample ID	Analysis	Analyte	URS Qual	Code	New RL
710035	No Qualifications			[		

SDG	Sample ID	Analysis	Analyte	URS Qual	New RL
710142	No Qualifications				

SDG	Sample ID	Analysis	Analyte	URS Qual	Code	New RL
710169	No Qualifications					

Summary of Qualifications for SDG 710169

SDG	Sample ID	Analysis	Analyte	URS Qual	Code	New RL
709432	VI-2-D	TO-15	4-Ethyltoluene	U	Х	-
709432	VI-2-B	TO-15	2-Butanone	U	X	-
709432	VI-2-B	TO-15	Benzene	U	Х	-
709494	VI-4-A	TO-15	Freon 12	UJ	L	-
709494	VI-4-B	TO-15	Freon 12	UJ	· L	-
709494	VI-3-A	TO-15	Freon 12	J	L	-
709528	VI-3-B	TO-15	Freon 12	J	L	-
709528	VI-3-C	TO-15	Freon 12	UJ	L	-
709528	VI-4-C	TO-15	Freon 12	J	L	-
709528	VI-4-C DUP	TO-15	Freon 12	J	L	
709528	VI-4-D	TO-15	Freon 12	UJ	L	-
709528	VI-4-E	TO-15	Freon 12	UJ	L	-
709557	VI-5-A	TO-15	m,p-Xylene	U	Х	-
709557	VI-5-A	TO-15	4-Ethyltoluene	U	X	-
709557	VI-5-B	TO-15	2-Butanone	U	X	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	2-Butanone	U	X	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	m,p-Xylene	Ü	Х	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	o -Xylene	U	X	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	4-Ethyltoluene	U	Х	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	U	Х	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Freon 114	· J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Chloroethane	J	S	
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Ethanol	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Acetone	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Methyl tert-butyl ether	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Hexane	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	1,1-Dichloroethane	1	S	
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Cyclohexane	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Heptane	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Toluene	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Tetrachloroethane	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15 SIM	Trichloroethene	J	S	-
709576	VI-12-A	TO-15	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	J.	С	-
709576	VI-10-A	TO-15	alpha-Chlorotoluene	UJ	C	
709576	VI-10-A	TO-15	Methyl tert-butyl ether	UJ	С	
709576	VI-6-A	TO-15	alpha-Chlorotoluene	UJ	С	-
709576	VI-6-A	TO-15	Methyl tert-butyl ether	UJ	С	-
709576	VI-12-A	TO-15	Ethanol	UJ	С	
709576	VI-12-A	TO-15	Methyl tert-butyl ether	UJ	С	-
709576	VI-10-A	TO-15	2-Butanone	J	С	-
709576	VI-6-A	TO-15	2-Butanone	UJ	С	_
709647	VI-11-A	TO-15	Acetone	Ü	X	-
709647	VI-11-A	TO-15	2-Butanone	U	X	-
709647	VI-11-A	TO-15	m,p-Xylene	U	Х	-
709647	VI-13-A	TO-15	2-Butanone	U	Х	
709647	VI-13-A	TO-15	Benzene	U	X	-
709647	VI-13-A	TO-15	m,p -Xylene	U	Х	-

#### Notes:

Dashed lines indicate a new RL was not required

C = Initial or continuing calibration %D or %RSD outside evaluation criteria

J = Estimated

L = Low LCS Recovery

S = High Surrogate Recovery

SIM = Selected Ion Monitoring

U = Non-detect

UJ = Estimated non-detect

X = Field Blank Contamination

#### $A \ xibn 9qq A \\$



TABLE A-1
Analytical Results SDGs 709432 - 710169

SDG	Sample ID	Matrix_	Parameter	Chemical	Result (μg/m³)	URS Qual, Code	RL (μg/m³)
709432	VI-2-D	Soil Gas	TO-15	4-Ethyltoluene	3.7	U,X	3.7
709432	VI-2-B	Soil Gas	TO-15	2-Butanone	1.2	U,X	1.2
709432	VI-2-B	Soil Gas	TO-15	Benzene	1.3	U,X	1.3
709494	VI-4-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	Freon 12	7.8	UJ,L	7.8
709494	VI-4-B	Soil Gas	TO-15	Freon 12	5.5	U),L	5.5
709494	VI-3-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	Freon 12	1.5	J,L	0.84
709528	VI-3-B	Soil Gas	TO-15	Freon 12	5.9	J,L	2.0
709528	VI-3-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	Freon 12	2.0	UJ,L	2.0
709528	VI-4-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	Freon 12	7.5	J,L	3.8
709528	VI-4-C DUP	Soil Gas	TO-15	Freon 12	8.6	J,L	8
709528	VI-4-D	Soil Gas	TO-15	Freon 12	5.3	UJ,L	5.3
709528	VI-4-E	Soil Gas	TO-15	Freon 12	0.81	UJ,L }	0.81
709557	VI-5-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	m,p-Xylene	1.8	U,X	1.8
709557	VI-5-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	4-Ethyltoluene	2.1	U,X	2.1
709557	VI-5-B	Soil Gas	TO-15	2-Butanone	4.6	U,X	4.6
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	2-Butanone	0.55	U,X	0.55
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	m,p-Xylene	0.81	U,X	0.81
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	o-Xylene	0.81	U,X	0.81
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	4-Ethyltoluene	0.92	U,X	0.92
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	0.92	U,X	0.92
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	Freon 114	3.2	J,S	1.3
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	Chloroethane	0.64	J,S	0.49
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	Ethanol	23 J	J,S	1.8
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	Acetone	85	J,S	2.2
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	Methyl tert-butyl ether	38 J	J,S	0.67
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	Hexane	82	J,S	0.66
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	1,1-Dichloroethane	18	J,S	0.76
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	3.1	J,S	0.74
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	Cyclohexane	20	J,S	0.64
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	Heptane	14	J,S	0.77
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	Toluene	100	J,S	0.7
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	Tetrachloroethane	1.5	J,S	1.3
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15 SIM	Trichloroethene	0.48	J,S	0.2
709576	VI-12-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	5.7	J,C	0.97
709576	VI-10-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	alpha-Chlorotoluene	1500	UJ,C	1500
709576	VI-10-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	Methyl tert-butyl ether	1100	UJ,C	1100
709576	VI-6-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	alpha-Chlorotoluene	8.8	UJ,C	8.8
709576	VI-6-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	Methyl tert-butyl ether	6.2	UJ,C	6.2
709576	VI-12-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	Ethanol	1.5	UJ,C	1.5
709576	VI-12-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	Methyl tert-butyl ether	0.58	UJ,C	0.58
709576	VI-10-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	2-Butanone	7000	J,C	880
709576	VI-6-A	Soil Gas	TO-15 TO-15	2-Butanone	5	UJ,C U,X	5
709647	VI-11-A	Soil Gas		Acetone	3.8		3.8
709647	VI-11-A	Soil Gas	TO-15 TO-15	2-Butanone	0.95 1.4	U,X	0.95
709647 709647	VI-11-A VI-13-A	Soil Gas Soil Gas	TO-15	m,p -Xylene 2-Butanone	0.46	U,X U,X	1.4 0.46
709647	VI-13-A VI-13-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	Benzene	0.46	U,X	0.46
709647	VI-13-A VI-13-A	Soil Gas Soil Gas	TO-15	m,p-Xylene	0.5	U,X U,X	0.5
109047	V1-13-M	3011 045	10-13	m,p - Aylone	0.07	0,^	0.07

#### Notes:

Dashed lines indicate a new RL was not required

μg/m³ = micrograms per cubic meters

C = Initial or continuing calibration %D or %RSD outside evaluation criteria

J = Estimated

L = Low LCS Recovery

S = High Surrogate Recovery

SIM ≈ Selected Ion Monitoring

U = Non-detec

UJ = Estimated non-detect

X = Field Blank Contamination





Sample Transportation Notice

Relinquishing signature on this document indicates that sample is being shipped in compliance with all applicable local, State, Federal, national, and international laws, regulations and ordinances of any kind. Air Toxics Limited assumes no tability with respect to the collection, handling or shipping of these samples. Relinquishing signature also indicates agreement to hold harmless, defend, and indemnity Air Toxics Limited against any claim, demand, or action, of any kind, related to the

collection	or, hending, or s	apibbing of sample	es. D.O.T. Hotins	9 (SOD) 4G7-4922				_ *'
Project Manager Bob Vilustra		<u></u> !	Project Info	):		Turn Around Time:	Leo Use Only	10
	mi Mo	Ber	P.O. #			XX Normal	Pressurized	2 1/11
Company URS Email	U			معرا المراسم			Date:	<u> - 110 t</u>
	State H ()	ً <u>کا اِکُما</u> qiZ ر	Project # Z_	1561683	<del></del>	Rush	Pressurizatio	n Gas:
	429-046		Project Name	SA2_		specify	$\left(N_{2}\right)$	He
		Date	Time			Canist	ter Pressure/	<b>√acuum</b>
Lab (.D. Field Sample I.D. (Location)	Сап#		of Collection	Analyses 1	Requested	initial	Finai Rece	pt Final
0A VI-2-B	000002511	9-19-07	0929	TO-15		30	5 469	145 16
		9-19-07	7	TO-15		. 30	\$ 25	
to make the state of the state		9-19-01		TO-15		30	5 3.5	A V
No. 10		,					,;,,,	7
44×4;							!	• •
					V11	•		
							<del></del>	
			·					
a.					***************************************			1
Refinquished by: (eignature) Dete/Time  #### Proof Co. 9-19-07-1170-5  Refinquished by: (eignature) Dete/Time	$\square Mgm$	oy: (eignatuild) VCO (M oy: (signaturo)	goen to		Notes:			
Relinquished by: (signature) Date/Time			Date/Time		<del></del>	<del></del>		
ala Shipper Name Air Bill		Temp (º	<u>C) C</u>	Condition	Custody Se		Work Order	- •
Use FEDEX 8606389	। प्यस्य	HJN!	- 15	<b>20</b> d	Yes No	· (·None	<u> </u>	9432
<i>b</i> , − − (*g*, *f*)								

Harm 1293 rep. 11

# Air Toxics LTD.

#### **CHAIN-OF-CUSTODY RECORD**

Sample Transportation Notice

Felimpulshing signature on this recument indicates that sample is being shipped in compliance with all applicable local. State, Federal, national, and international laws, regulations and ordinances of any kind. Air loxes Limited assumes no lisbility with respect to the collection, handling or shipping of these samples. Rol nquishing signature also indicates agreement to hold harmless, defend, and indemnify Air Toxics Limited against any claim, demand, or action, of any kind, related to the collection, handling, or shipping of samples. C.O.T. Hotline (800) 467-4922

1 1				- ( ,						<u> </u>
Project Manager Kob VILLETTO			Project Info	<b>)</b> :			round ne:	Leb Use (	• *	h
Collected by: (Print and Sign) Silling Mase Su	waller		P.O. #			□ Noi			rized by:	JATA
Company URS Corp Email						1		Date:		MAT!
Address On Highland Phrady City St. Link's	State MO	Zip 1/3/10	Project # Z	1561683		□ Rus	sh ;	Pressu	yizatlo'n G	3 <b>2</b> \$:
Phone 34-429-0100 Fax 514.	429-04	02	Project Name	SAZ	<b></b> ·		ocity .		N <sub>2</sub> ) He	÷
		Date	Time				Canis	ter Pres	sure/Vac	ะนนกา
Lab I.D. Field Sample I.D. (Location)	Can#	of Collection		Analyses	Requested		Initial	Final	Receipt	Final
014 VI -4 - A	000002025	9-21-07	0838	TO-15	<u>_</u>		30	5	4511	500
67A VI -4-8 *	013656	İ	1007	TD-15			30	5	4.014	
34 VI-092107-FB	000001101	{	1022	TD-15			30	\$	405710	
104 VI-3-A	00000337	V	14/2	10-15			36	5	100/	V
									T.	:
					<del></del>					
			-							1
<b>2000</b>										
Calledon Defenda			,	·						
Relinquished by: (signature) Date/Time	1 /1 /	v; (signature)			Notes:	_				
			FTC 9/20	107-0830						
Relinquished by: (eignature) Date/Time	Received 6	y: (elgnature)	Date/Time	·						
Relinquished by: (signature) Date/Time	Received b	y: (signature)	Date/Time							
	i									
Lab Snipper Name Air Bil		Temp (=0	C) C	ondition	Custody Se	als intac	d7	Work (	Order#	
Use Fed Ex 860638919	504	NA	-	good	Yes No	Nor	/e)	07	001	94
Only				U				<b>U</b> ("	<b>**</b>	9 Z



Sample Transportation Notice
Reliaquishing signature or this ducument indicates that sample is being shipped in combiance with all applicable local, State, Federal, national, and international laws, regulations and ordinance of any kind. Air Toxics Limited essumes no liability with respect to the collection, handling or shipping of these samples. Relinquishing egnature also indicates agreement to hold harmless, defend, and indemnity Air Toxics Limited against any claim, demand, or action, of any kind, related to the

	colle	School, nendling, or shipping of semi	ples. D.O.T. Hotime (8)	00) 467-4922		. Fa	396 1-01-t-
Project Man	nager Bob Velustra	<del></del>	Project Info:		Turn Around	Dense	urized by VAR
	(Print and Sign) Sherry Woord	Shughtone_	P.O. #		Normal	Date	9/26/01
company 1	1 Highland Platery St. Low	L DIN MAZOLENIA	Projec: # 2/5	521683	☐ Rush	Į.	surization Gas:
		13 State 110 2000 110	Project Namo 2			11	N He
S :		Date	Time			ter Pre	ssure/Vacuum
Leb LD.	Field Sample I.D. (Location)	,	of Collection	Analyses Requested	Initial	Final	Receipt Final
OLAN	VI-3-B	000002476 9-240	10846	TO-15	30	5	5.0% 5.0
	VI-3-C	000001591	0934		27	5	5.00 1
034	VI-4-C	00000865	1210		30	5	3.54
D'IA I	VI-4-C DUP	436	1210		30	<u> </u>	15.094
<u>⊃5A;</u> \	VI-4-D	000000963	1309		50	5	5.014
XO(+)	<u> 41-4-6</u>	825002188 V	1524		30	.5	5.544V
		!	<del>                                     </del>			<u> </u>	+
			+ +		<del></del>		<del>                                     </del>
			<u>'</u>				\- <del></del>
Deline less	ழ் by; (signature) Date/Time	. Heogiyed by: (signature),	Dáte/T:ma	, Notes:			
Allin	_	so Monuca E	MONEYA D	12507 85			
	by: (signature) Date/Time	Received by: (signature)	Date/Time	10.000			
Cau-v-bo	Alba isi		-	· ·			
remodnisne	ed by: (signature) Date/Timo	Received by: (signature)	Date/lime				
Lab	Shipper Name Air f	318 # Temp	(°C) Con	dition Custody Se	als Intact?	·Work	Order#.
Use [	ed. Ex 8606389		Good	<del>ننينٽسيني</del> · <del>مندسسي</del>	None	Λo	19952m
Only.						47	68779



Sample Transportation Notice

Relinquishing signature on this document indicates that sample is being shipped in compliance with all applicable local. State, Federal, national, and international awa, regulations and ordinances of any kind. Air textee Limited assumes no liability with respect to the collection, handing or shipping of these samples. Relinquishing agreement to hold harmless, defend, and indemnity Air Toxics Limited against any calm, demand, or sulion, of any kind, related to the

CHAHAO	Calleati	on, bandling, or	iqmae to gniqqiria	es. D.C.T. Holling	(80C) 467-4922			Pa	ge (	of
	ager 200 Venstra	<b></b>		Project Info	**************************************		Around me:	Leb Use	Ony Wized)by:	18
	(Print and Sign) Sherry Moore/S	Muyla		P.O. #		N/EX			9/29	<i>7</i> 77 - "
	PS CORD Email		- 102110	Project # 7/	561683	□ Ri			unization (	• 1
	the hunds the Droit St. Lovis	State M.O.		Emiart Nama	561683 SA2			116650	H	
Prone - 14 -	-4-61-0100 FW _31.7	7.2.1.			<i>////</i>	57	Cents	ter Pres	ssure/Vac	
Láb l.D.	Field Sample I.D. (Location)	Can#	Date of Collection	Time of Collection	Analyses Requested		Initial	Final	Receipt	Final
014 N	II-5-A	000003010	9-25-07	0831	-10-15		24.5	5	100%	Silve
62A	II-5-B	00000 1893	[	0924			30	5	400	
A Second Co.		1000 as 1544		1204			30	8	9.5	1
OB V	I-092504-FB	0000034	$\downarrow$	344	<u> </u>		28.5	5	208	1 V
								,	*	
-0										
XIIII	by: (signature) Date/Time  7.25.07 / 30  Pay: (signature) Date/Time	Men	y: (signatifice) UCQ (TE y: (signature)	gren AT	7. 9/26/5 840	<del>-</del>			•	
	d by: (signature) Data/Time		y: (signature)							
		#;		C) C	ondition Custody Se				Order#	
Uss 2	ed Ex 186063891.	4178	MA	50	Yes N	) (No	ne	<del>&gt;07</del>	095	57

collecti	on, handling, or	ehipping of samp	es. D.C.T. Hattin	e (6CC) 467-4322					ae ,	" ——
Project Manager Bob Vellustva	<b>.</b>		Project Inf	o;		Turn	Around me:	Leb Use		1/60
Collected by: (Primand Sign) SNUTVY MODIFE S	12-1		HO.#			<b>12</b>		•	unzed by:	1
Company UKS COOP Email						,		Date:	912	8/07
Address 1001 thanlands Phan Biry St. Low	S State MC	Zp63/10		156168		O R	רופנ	Prėssi	urization (	⊋as:
	129-04		Project Nam	SAZ		a	zecity		N) H	3
	_	Date	Time				Canis	ter Pre:	ssure/Vac	:uum
Lab I.D. Field Sample I.D. (Location)	Can #	of Collection	of Collection	Analy	ses Requested		Initial	Final	Receipt.	Final
DIA VI-ID-A	0000000417	9/26/02	0823	70-15	(Oxagen)	)	30	4	3.04	5.00
VI-10 B 5-7-26-01	00000165	1					<del></del>		<u> </u>	
DANI-6-A	0800030 <b>8</b>	326/02	1147	10-15	(oxugen)		30	४	6.5 KM	5.00
034 VI-12-A	94300	V	1514	10-15	(exuger)		30	6	5.00	
**************************************										
				<del></del>						3. 5
		<u> </u>							. ,	
							,		:	
Relinquished by: (signature) Date/Time	YIIon	y: (signatyte) // / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /	geen f	A7 880 C	Notes:					
Relinquished by: (signature) Date:Time	Received b	y: (signature)	Date/Time							
Lab Skilpper Narie: Air Bill	#	. Temp (°	C) C	Condition	Custody.Ser	els Inte	ioi?	Work	Order#	-
Use FA SV 8/20/28910	1489	-MA		Pol	Yes No	No	ne \	70	9578	
Only						-				

Form 1247 ray 11



Sample Transportation Notice
Relinquishing signature on this document indicates that sample is being shipped in compliance with all applicable local. State, Federal, retional, and international laws, regulations and ordinances of any kind. Air Toxice Limited assumes no lability with respect to the collection, handling or shipping of these samples. Relinquishing signature also indicates agreement to hold harmless, detend, and indemnify Air Toxics. Limited example is being shipped in compliance with all BLUE RAVINE ROAD, SUITE B FOLSOM, CA 95630-4719 (916) 985-1090 FAX (916) 985

Project Manager BD VILISTRA  Collected by: (Print and Sign) NINVY MODIC  Company UVPS Ema  Address/00/HK Lauds FI City ST Lau  Phone 3 4-499-000 Fax	) Zp	Project Info	1 <u>561683</u>		Turn Around Time:  Normal Rush	Date:	only Jrized by: 9/2 unization ( N <sub>2</sub> ) He	<i>9/0</i> 7 ias:		
Lab I.D. Field Sample I.D. (Location)	Can #	Date of Collection	Time of Collection	Analys	es Requested	Canis Initial	ter Pres	ssure/Vac		
OA VI-10-D		9-27-07		10-15	1+ DXW	3D	8	Receipt 7.0%	•	05.
41. 2. 1			, , <del>- 10, F</del>		(			<u> </u>	7	
MV N.S.		:								
W 1899									,	
Markey .									·	]
70 (2012) 2013 (2014)								<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
			······································	-		<u> </u>	ļ			
Amilian (Maria) Programmes			•							1
Relinquished by: (signature) Date/Time  Relinquished by: (signature) Date/Time  Relinquished by: (signature) Date/Time	) Mov	y: (signature) (	Den A	n abishor	Notes: 945					
Lab Shipper.Name Air	Bi[l#	lemp (	C) ; (C	ondition	Custody Se	els Intext?	Work	Order#		
Use Fed Ex 86063	891 92191	D W	I Gre	න්	Yes No	None	070	9608	3	



Sample Transportation Notice
Relinquishing signature on this document indicates that sample is being shipped in compliance with all applicable local, State, Federal, national, and international laws, regulations and ordinances of any kind. Air Toxics Limited assumes no liability with respect to the collection, handling or shipping of these samples. Relinquishing signature also indicates agreement to hold harmless, defend, and indemnify Air Toxics Limited against any claim, demand, or action, of any kind, related to the collection, handling, or shipping of samples. D.O.T. Hotline (800) 467-4922

180 BLUE RAVINE ROAD, SUITE B FOLSOM, CA 95630-4719 (916) 985-1000 FAX (916) 985-1020

	collec	tion, handling, or s			10, or action, of any k 2 (800) 467-4922	ing, related to th	e		Pag	ge <u> </u>	yt
	anager Bob Veenstra			Project Info	):			Around me:	Lab Use (		69
	by: (Print and Sign) Shemy Marce S	Mit Me		P.O. #		1	I <b>X</b> No			rized by:	
Company_	URS COYD. Email	<del> </del>			1	,	[ *		Date:	10184	<u>/                                    </u>
Address	Ol Highlands Plazacity St. Loui	State ND	Zip63110		1561683		☐ Ru	ısh	Pressu	rization C	3as:
		-429-04		Project Name	5A-2		sp	ecify		N₂) He	3
			Date	Time				Canis	ter Pres	sure/Vac	uum
Lab I.D.	Field Sample I.D. (Location)	Can #	of Collection	of Collection	Analyses	Requested	ASTM.	Initial	Final	Receipt	Final (psi)
OA	VI-11-A	000003447	9-28-07	0939	10-15	TOLGAL	N74	30	5	50 h	Silve
02A	VI-11-A DUP	4588	i	0939	TO-159L	SIM ASTME	HI4	30	5	5.0Ha	1
03A	VI-13-A	12671		1241				30	5	4.5114	
64A	VI - 092807-FB	000003172	V	1312				30	5	55110	V
	•						_				
			\								
	·										
Reinquist	ned-by: (signature) Date/Time			Date/Time	900	Notes:					,
Relinquisi	ned by: (signature) Date/Time		y: (signature)	9/29/57 Date/Time	'						. :
ľ			, , ,								
Relinquish	ned by: (signature) Date/Time	Received b	y: (signature)	Date/Time							ļ
Lab	Shipper Name Air Bl	    #	Temp (°	C) C	ondition .	Custody Se	als Jata	ıçt?	Work	Order#	
Use	Fedex 86063891949	A*	NA	0000	1	Yes No		<del>-\</del>	07	096	47
Only	10000001111		<u> </u>	1 0000	<u> </u>	!:: <u></u>				<u> </u>	



Sample Transportation Notice
Ralinquishing signature on this document indicates that earries is being shipped in compliance with all applicable local, State, Federal, national, and international laws, regulations and ordinances of any kind. Air Toxics Limited assumes no liability with respect to the collection, bandling or shipping of these samples. Palinquishing signature also indicates agreement to hold harmless, defend, and indemnify Air Toxics Limited against any claim, demand, or action, of any kind, related to the collection, handling, or shipping of samples, D.O.T. Hottine (800) 457-4922

A Commence of the Commence of

180 BLUE RAVINE ROAD, SUITE B FOLSOM, CA 95630-4719 (916) 985-1000 FAX (916) 985-1020

	Z - 1	,			,,					
Project Ma	anager BOD VILLETTA	·	Project Info	:		Turn Around	Lab (Iso	Ontr VI	,]	
	by: (Para And Sign) NUTY WOOTE KA	my hea	<u></u>	P.O. #			Time:	Pressu	onty unized by: VFR	ľ
Company					1 30		Normal	Date:	10/2/07	
Address OC	1 Hahland 3 Plaza De ciny of Louis	State MI	Zp 63110	1 2 50 1			Pressi	urization Gas:	<u> </u>	
Phone	Fax			Project Name	592	·	apacity		N <sub>2</sub> He	J
			Date	Time			Canis	ter Pres	ssure/Vacuum	1
Lab I.D.	Field Sample I.D. (Location)	Can #	of Callection	of Collection	Analyse	s Requested	Initial	Final	Receipt Final	1
EAS.	VI-10-81	35636	10-1-07	1027	TO-15	Duas	30	5	4.0"445	1000
<b>DD()</b>	NI-10-C.1	000002147	(	1002			30	5	4.50/18	1"
<del>1) (</del>	VI-6-81	000002774		1320			29	2	6007fg	1
OFF	Y T - 6 - C1	000000054		1401	A		28	5	6.00AN	1
										1
			······································	·		<del></del>	······		· · · ·	1
1, 200	,						• • •		•	1
					,··· , <u>-</u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1 T 141 (Adm 1 mm			1
							<del></del>	 I		1
					<u>-</u>					1
Relinguist	ned My: (signature) Date:Tinje	Received b	y: (signatur <b>e)</b>	Date/Time	1 (61	Notes:	<del></del>	<u> </u>	<u></u>	1
	4160 10-107 1480		wa li	1992en	ALLIDA	ग ह्य				Į.
<b>Figurquist</b>	by: (signature) Date:Time	Received b	y: (signature)	Deta/Time	• 1 `					
<u> Valinoviet</u>	ned by; (signature) Date/Time	Possiumd h	y: (signature)	Data/Time		·				
- rom de a	ios of, languatural Data: tring	T TOUGHT C	y. (signatele)	<i>₽</i> α.(9) ( 11116	,					
Lab _	Shipper Name Air Bil	#	Temp (	°C) C	ondition	Custody Se	als Intact?"	Work	Order #	1
Use	Fed & 86232540		MA	- (27)	24	Yes No	. ~ ~ ``	071	0035	1
Only										1



Sample Transportation Notice
Relirquishing signature on this document indicates that sample is being chipped in compliance with all applicable local, Stats. Faceral, national, and international laws, regulations and ordinances of any kind. Air Toxics Limited assumes no liability with respect to the collection, handling or shipping of those samples. Relinquishing signature also indicates agreement to hold handless, delient, and indemnity Air Toxics. Limited against any plains, demand, or action, of any kind, related to the

		ion, handing, or s	shipping of sempl	es, D.O.T. Hotlir	18 (800) 467-4822				1 12	ac 7 /	" <del></del>	
	inager BOD Velusta			Project Inf	o:		Turn Ar		Lab Use	Опц	160	(
	py: (Printiand Sign) Sherry Moore/ Su	uy Mea		P.O.#			Tim X Norr			omy Urized by:		
	IRS Corp =mail _	···			156/683		Rus			-10[	- E:	
	of Highlands Plazatorcin St. Louis		Zip (3(10)	Project # 2	1301402		₩ Rus	rı	Pressi	urization (	∋as:	
hone 31	1-429-000 Fax 314-	429-04	62_	Project Nam	ia		spec	ily		N <sub>2</sub> H	j. ·	
Lati I.D.	Field Sample I.D. (Location)	Can #	Date of Collection	Time of Collection	Analyses	Requested	ļ	Canist	Final	Receipt	<del>, , ,</del>	
	VI-9-4	000003344	10-3-07		TO-15 1481M			30	5	4.5%	(2007)	25
	VI-9-8	000002638	<del> </del>	0856		<u> </u>		26.5	5	7.5%	V A	7
Q3A		000003464		1058				30	8	2.04	(**	l
	VI-8-C	000002592	Γ 1, 1	1601	V	<i></i>		30	8	7.5%	41	
												Į .
e =				\ <u>.</u>								
				! 			i				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Helincuist	red by: (signaturo) Date/Time  / 103-04 /1788		y: (signature) _		0/4/07 0835	Notes:						
-	red by: (signature) Date/Time		y: (signature)		4 1167 - 2037							Ì
	····				(							
Relinguish	red by: (signature) Date/Time	Received by	y: (s.gnatura)	Date/Time								
Lab	Shipper Neme Air Bi		Temp (°	C) . (	Condition	Custody Sea	els intac	<del>(3</del>	Work	Order#	-	1
Use		8:76	MA		000	Yes No	٠٠. بخسنز	<u> </u>	771	014	3	1
Only	iji da listin	······································						-				l



Sample Transportation Notice
Relinquishing signature on this document indicates that cample is being shipped in compliance with all applicable local, State, Federal, retional, and international laws, regulations and ordinances of any kind. Air Toxice Limited accumes no liability with respect to the cofection, handling or shipping of these eartiples. Relinquiching afgrature also indicates agreement to hold harmless, defend, and indemnity Air Toxice Limited against any claim, demand, or action, of any kind, related to the collection, handling, or shipping of samples, D.O.T. Hottine (800) 467-4822

180 BLUE RAVINE ROAD, SUITE B FOLSOM, CA 95690-4719 (916) 985-1000 FAX (916) 985-1020

Form 120% tox11

Page: Project Manager ROD V CLUSTOC Turn Around Lab Use Only Project Info: Time: Pressurized:by: Collected by: (Print and Sign) SALTCU MODO) Mormal P.O.# COMPANY URS CHEF Project # 21501683 ☐ Rush ous smell Dzp 1810 Pressurization Gas: Fax 214- 1129-0462 Project Name вресбу Canister Pressure/Vacuum Date Time of Collection of Collection Lab LD Field Sample I.D. (Location) Сап# Analyses Requested initial Final **Flacetot** 0908 000000505 Perhausted by (signature) Date/Time Received by: (signature) Date/Time Notes: Preimpistud by: (signature) DeterTime Received by: (signature) Date/Time Relinquished by: (signature) Date/Time Received by: (signature) Date/Time Shipper Name Air Bill #: Temp (°C) ... Condition Custody Seels Intact? Work:Order # Lab Use Yes No None JUT Only

·6/13

 $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{p}}$ 



# DATA VALIDA. JN WORKSHEET VOLATILE ORGANIC ANALYSIS

Reviewer	: Steve Gragert	Project Name:	Sauget - Area 2 Air Sampling
Date	: 11/13/2007	Project Number:	21561683.80012
Laboratory	Air Toxics	SDG No.:	0709432
•		Review Level:	Level III
Major Anomolie	es:		
	No samples were rejected		
Minor Anomolie	es:		
	Samples were qualified "U" due to field blank contaminaton.		
Field IDs:	VI-2-B		

# 1.0 Chain of Custody/Sample Condition

VI-091907-FB VI-2-D

1.1 Do Chain-of-Custody forms list all samples analyzed? 1.2 Are all Chain-of-Custody forms signed, indicating sample chain-of-custody was maintained? 1.3 Do the Traffic Reports, chain-of-custody, and lab narrative indicate any problems with sample receipt,			Yes	No	NA
1.3 Do the Traffic Reports, chain-of-custody, and lab narrative indicate any problems with sample receipt,	1.1	Do Chain-of-Custody forms list all samples analyzed?	u X		
	1.2	Are all Chain-of-Custody forms signed, indicating sample chain-of-custody was maintained?	**************************************		
	1.3	Do the Traffic Reports, chain-of-custody, and lab narrative indicate any problems with sample receipt,			
condition of samples, analytical problems or special circumstances affecting the quality of the data?		condition of samples, analytical problems or special circumstances affecting the quality of the data?		X	

Note: No issues were noted in the laboratory case narrative or cooler receipt forms.

# 2.0 Holding Time/ Preservation (Code H)

		Yes	No	NA
2.1	Do sample preservation, collection and storage condition meet method requirement?	X		
	It sample preservation and/or temperature was mappropriate (i.e., 12 >0 C, etc.), comment in report.			
	unpreserved or temperature is outside the range 0° (but not frozen) to 10° flag all positive results with a			
	"J" and all non-detects "UJ". If temperature exceeds 10°, flag positive detections "J" and non-detects			
2.2	Have any technical holding times, determined from sampling to date of analysis, been exceeded? If yes,			
	J(+)/UJ(-).		<b>X</b>	
	Matrix Preserved Holding Time			
	Air No 14 days			
2.3	Have any technical holding times been grossly (twice the holding time) exceeded? If yes, J(+)/R(-).	- 2	* X .	
Note:	All holding time criteria were met.	<del></del>		

		Yes	No	NA.
3.1	Are GC/MS Tuning and Mass Calibration forms present for bromofluorobenzene (BFB)?	\$4.014th		X
3.2	Have all samples been analyzed within twelve hours of the BFB tune? If no, flag R.	<b>经产生等</b>		Х
3.3	Have ion abundance criteria for BFB been met for each instrument used? It no, flag R.	A. Fried		X

Note:

### 4.0 Blanks (Method Blanks, Field Blanks and Trip Blanks)

(Code X - Field Blank Contamination, Code Y - Trip blank contamination, Code Z - Method blank contamination)

		Yes	No	NA
4.1	Is a Method Blank Summary form present for each batch?	. X		
4.2	Do any method blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		X	
4.3	Do any field/trip rinse/equipment blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?	X		•
	Action: Positive sample results <5X (or 10X for common volatile lab contaminants- methylene chloride,			
	acetone, and 2-butanone) the blank concentration should be qualified "U". The result should be			
· ·	elevated to the RL for estimate (laboratory "J" flagged) concentrations.			
4.4	If Level IV, review raw data and verify all detections for blanks were reported.			X

Note:

Field Blank VI-091907-FB had detections of the following analytes (in µg/m²): Chloromethane (0.32), Ethanol (2.8), Acetone (13), 2-Butanone (9.8), Benzene (0.51), Toluene (2.8), m,p-Xylene (2.4), 4-Ethyltoluene (0.85), 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene (0.90), and Oxygen (20%). Professional judgment was used to not qualify Oxygen due to the fact it is naturally occurring in the air. Analytes that required qualification due to Field Blank detections are located in the table below:

Field ID	Analyte(s)	Qualification	Code	Batch #	Justification
VI-2-D	4-Ethyltoluene	U	X	y092515.d	Field Blank contamination
VI-2-B	2-Butanone	U	X	y092515.d	Field Blank contamination
VI-2-B	Benzene	U	X	y092515.d	Field Blank contamination

# 5.0 GC/MS Initial Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
5.1	Are Initial Calibration summary forms present and complete for each instrument used?	1000		X
5.2	Are CCCs linear applying either %RSD < 30% and all other compounds <15% or >0.990?			x
	If not, J(+)/ UJ(-). In extreme cases, the reviewer may flag non-detects "R".			
5.3	Do any SPCC compounds have an RRF less than specification or any other compounds < 0.05 (use 0.01)			X
5.4	Is the lowest standard at the same concentration, or lower, as the RL reported? If not, elevate RL.	(4) (4-1)		X
5.5	If Level IV, recalculate a sample of RRFs and %RSDs to verify correct calculations are being made.			X

# Continuing Calibration (Code C)

			Yes	No	NA
	6.1		9/81970.00		Х
	6.2		41. <b>X</b> 87.44		X
	6.3		* 2000		X
	6.4	Do any compounds have a % difference (or % drift for quantitation from a curve) (%D) between initial		1636.339	X
		If yes, a marginal increase in response >20% then J(+) only; a decrease in response then J(+)/ UJ(-). For			
1	6.5	Do any compounds have an RRF < 0.05 (use 0.01 for poor responders)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$ .		**************************************	X
	6.6	If Level IV, calculate a sample of RFs and %Ds from ave RF to verify correct calculations.			Х

Note:

# 7.0 Surrogate Recovery (Code S)

					Yes	No	NA
7.1	Are all sampl	es listed on the a	opropriate Surrogate Recovery S	Summary Form ?	: <b>X</b>		
7.2	Are surrogate	recoveries within	n acceptance criteria specified in	the QAPP for all samples?	X		
7.3	If No in Secti	ion 7.2, were thes	e sample(s) or method blank(s)	reanalyzed?			Х
7.4	If No in Secti	ion 7.3, is any sar	nple dilution factor greater than	10? (Surrogate recoveries may be			Х
	Note: If SMC recoveries do not meet acceptance criteria in samples chosen for the MS/MSD or diluted						
		> UCL	10% to LCL	< 10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			•

Note:

All surrogate recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

# 8.0 Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate (MS/MSD) or one MS with a Sample Duplicate (Recovery - Code M, RPD - Code D)

		Yes	No	NA
8.1	Is a Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate recovery form present?		X	
8.2	Are MS/MSDs analyzed at the required frequency of one matrix spike per ten samples and a duplicate per twenty for each matrix?	127		x
8.3	Are all MS/MSD %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria Specified in the QAPP?	10 F . 2 F		X
_	Using informed professional judgment, the data reviewer should use the MS and MSD results in conjunction with other QC criteria and determine the need for qualification of the data for samples from the same site/matrix. Recoveries <10% may require rejection. RPD failures may be flagged "J" (+			

Note:

MS/MSD samples were not submitted for analysis.

# Laboratory Control Sample (LCS/LCSD) (Recovery - Code L, Ri Code E)

			Yes	No	<u>NA</u>
	9.1	Is an LCS recovery form present?	2 X		
	9.2	Is an LCS analyzed at the required frequency of one per twenty field samples for each matrix?	N.XE.		
	9.3	Are all LCS %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria specified in the QAPP?	X		
	9.4	If Level IV, verify the % recoveries are calculated correctly.			X
		Action for specific compound outside the acceptance criteria: %R>UCL,			
		J(+) only; $<$ LCL, $J(+)/UJ(-)$ ; $<$ 30% $J(+)/R(-)$ . RPD failures should be flagged "J" (+ only)			

Note:

All LCS recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

# 10.0 Internal Standards (Code I)

					Yes	No	NA
10.1	Are internal star	ndard areas for every sample	and blank within upper an	d lower QC limits?	Z.		
		Area > +100%	Area < -50%	Area < -10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			
Note:	calibration, not	cification is for the continui sample to continuing calibra aformed professional judgme	ation. Thus, if all other QC	specifications are met for a	- 1		
10.2	Are retention tir	nes of internal standards wit	thin 30 seconds of the association	ciated calibration standard?	<b>X</b> , v	ž.	
	Action: The chromatogram must be examined to determine if any false positives or negatives exist. For shift of a large magnitude, the reviewer may consider partial or total rejection of the data for non-detects in that sample/fraction.						

Note:

Internal standard area counts and retention times were within evaluation criteria.

11.0 TCL Identi	fication (Code W)	Yes	No	NA
11.1	Is the relative retention time (RRT) of each reported compound within 0.06 RRT units of the standard	0.000		Х
11.2	Are the three ions of greatest intensity present in the standard mass spectrum also present in the sample			X

Note:

12.0 TCL/TI	Yes	No	NA NA	
12.1	Are RLs used consistent with those specified in the QAPP?	1500		X
12.2	Are these limits adjusted to reflect dilutions and/ or percent solids as required?	11 7 15 1		x
12.3	Are TIC ions greater than ten percent in the reference spectrum also present in the sample spectrum?	112 142		X
12.4	Are any positives reported that exceed the linear range of the instrument? If yes, than flag "J".		270500	X
12.5	If Level IV, calculate a sample of positive results to verify correct calculations			X

Field Duplicate Samples (Code F)				NA
13.1	Were any field duplicates submitted for VOC analysis?		x	
13.2	Were all RPD or absolute difference values within the control limits outlined in the QAPP?			х
	Action: No qualifying action is taken based on field duplicate results, however the data validator should			
	provide a qualitative assessment in the data validation report.			
Note:	Field duplicate samples were not submitted for analysis.			

# 14.0 Data Completeness

		Yes	No	NA.
14.1	Is % completeness within the control limits? (Control limit: Check QAPP or use 95% for aqueou	ıs 🔭 🛣	ri e	
14.2	Number of samples: 3			
14.3	Number of target compounds in each analysis: 60			
14.4	Number of results rejected and not reported: 0			
	% Completeness = $100 \times ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)$			
	% Completeness 100			

# DATA VALIDA JON WORKSHEET VOLATILE ORGANIC ANALYSIS

Reviewer:	Reviewer: Steve Gragert Project Name:					
Date:	11/13/2007 Project Number:					
Laboratory	Severn Trent Laboratory - Savannah SDG No.:		0709494			
	Review Level:		Level III			
Major Anom	olies:					
, and the second	No samples were rejected					
Minor Anom	olies:					
	Samples were qualified "J/UJ" due to low LCS recovery.					
				*		
Field IDs:	VI-4-A					
	VI-4-B					
	VI-092107-FB					
	VI-3-A					
1.0 Chain as	Custodu/Sample Condition					
1.0 Cham of	Custody/Sample Condition	Yes	No	NA		
1.1	Do Chain-of-Custody forms list all samples analyzed?	Ex.				
1.2	Are all Chain-of-Custody forms signed, indicating sample chain-of-custody was maintained?		X			
1.3	Do the Traffic Reports, chain-of-custody, and lab narrative indicate any problems with sample receipt,					
	condition of samples, analytical problems or special circumstances affecting the quality of the data?	]	χ	İ		
Nata				C - 1		
Note:	The laboratory case narrative indicated the COC was not signed by the field sampler. Chain of custody was not relinquished p					
	of the discrepancy. The laboratory indicated the cooler arrived with custody seals intact and all samples were recived in good of data was required. No other issues were noted in the laboratory case narrative or cooler receipt forms.	condition.	No quantica	.don		
	of data was required. No other issues were noted in the laboratory case halfative of cooler receipt forms.		•			
2.0 Holding	Time/ Preservation (Code H)					
210 120141119	7	Yes	No	NA		
2.1	Do comple preservation, collection and storage condition most method requirement?					
2.1	Do sample preservation, collection and storage condition meet method requirement? It sample preservation and/or temperature was inappropriate (i.e., <2 >0 C, etc.), comment in report. It	3793-A		·		
	unpreserved or temperature is outside the range 0° (but not frozen) to 10° flag all positive results with a					
II.	"J" and all non-detects "UJ". If temperature exceeds 10°, flag positive detections "J" and non-detects					
	lupu	<b></b>	aria China China	<del></del>		
2.2	Have any technical holding times, determined from sampling to date of analysis, been exceeded? If yes,		X,	İ		
	J(+)/UJ(-).	<del> </del>	CTAY OF	<u> </u>		
	Matrix Preserved Holding Time					
	Air No 14 days	<del> </del>	Section and the section of the secti			
2.3	Have any technical holding times been grossly (twice the holding time) exceeded? If yes, J(+)/R(-).	<u> </u>	X X	L		

Note:

All holding time criteria were met.

		Yes	No	NA
3.1	Are GC/MS Tuning and Mass Calibration forms present for bromofluorobenzene (BFB)?	1000		Х
3.2	Have all samples been analyzed within twelve hours of the BFB tune? If no, flag R.	PARTY.		х
3.3	Have ion abundance criteria for BFB been met for each instrument used? If no, flag R.	A STATE OF		х

Note:

#### 4.0 Blanks (Method Blanks, Field Blanks and Trip Blanks)

(Code X - Field Blank Contamination, Code Y - Trip blank contamination, Code Z - Method blank contamination)

		Yes	No '	NA
4.1	Is a Method Blank Summary form present for each batch?	X		
4.2	Do any method blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		7 X	
4.3	Do any field/trip rinse/equipment blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		X	
	Action: Positive sample results <5X (or 10X for common volatile lab contaminants- methylene chloride, acetone, and 2-butanone) the blank concentration should be qualified "U". The result should be elevated to the RL for estimate (laboratory "J" flagged) concentrations.			
4.4	If Level IV, review raw data and verify all detections for blanks were reported.			X

Note:

Field Blank VI-092107-FB had a detection of Oxygen (20%). Professional judgment was used to not qualify Oxygen due to the fact it is naturally occurring in the air.

#### 5.0 GC/MS Initial Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
5.1	Are Initial Calibration summary forms present and complete for each instrument used?			X
5.2	Are CCCs linear applying either %RSD < 30% and all other compounds <15% or >0.990?			X
	If not, J(+)/ UJ(-). In extreme cases, the reviewer may flag non-detects "R".	Ī		
5.3	Do any SPCC compounds have an RRF less than specification or any other compounds < 0.05 (use 0.01		C. 2.7	
	for poor responders like ketones or alcohols)? If yes, J(+)/R(-).	}		х
5.4	Is the lowest standard at the same concentration, or lower, as the RL reported? If not, elevate RL.	624		x
5.5	If Level IV, recalculate a sample of RRFs and %RSDs to verify correct calculations are being made.			x
Note:				

6.0 Continuing Calibration (Code C)

#### Yes No NA 200 Are Continuing Calibration Summary forms present and complete? X 6.2 Has a continuing calibration standard been analyzed every 12 hours? Area ( Have all SPCCs and CCCs met method specifications? If not, comment in report, proceed to 6.4. 79832 U 6.3 Do any compounds have a % difference (or % drift for quantitation from a curve) (%D) between initial and continuing calibration RRF outside QC limits (%D < 20%)? If yes, a marginal increase in response >20% then J(+) only; a decrease in response then J(+)/ UJ(-). For %D > 50%, flag R. 6.5 Do any compounds have an RRF < 0.05 (use 0.01 for poor responders)? If yes, J(+)/R(-). If Level IV, calculate a sample of RFs and %Ds from ave RF to verify correct calculations. 6.6

# 7.0 Surrogate Recovery (Code S)

_			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	_	Yes	No	NA
7.1	Are all sampl	es listed on the app	ropriate Surrogate Recovery Su	mmary Form ?	X ff		
7.2	Are surrogate	Are surrogate recoveries within acceptance criteria specified in the QAPP for all samples?					
7.3	If No in Secti	If No in Section 7.2, were these sample(s) or method blank(s) reanalyzed?					
7.4	If No in Section 7.3, is any sample dilution factor greater than 10? (Surrogate recoveries may be diluted out.)						x
	Note: If SMC recoveries do not meet acceptance criteria in samples chosen for the MS/MSD or diluted						
		> UCL	10% to LCL	< 10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			

Note: All surrogate recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

#### 8.0 Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate (MS/MSD) or one MS with a Sample Duplicate (Recovery - Code M, RPD - Code D)

		Yes	No	NA
8.1	Is a Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate recovery form present?	# #X P	X	
8.2	Are MS/MSDs analyzed at the required frequency of one matrix spike per ten samples and a duplicate per twenty for each matrix?			x
8.3	Are all MS/MSD %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria Specified in the QAPP?			х
	Using informed professional judgment, the data reviewer should use the MS and MSD results in conjunction with other QC criteria and determine the need for qualification of the data for samples from the same site/matrix. Recoveries <10% may require rejection. RPD failures may be flagged "J" (+			

Note: MS/MSD samples were not submitted for analysis.

#### 9.0 Laboratory Control Sample (LCS/LCSD) (Recovery - Code L, RPD - Code E)

		Yes	No	NA
9.1	Is an LCS recovery form present?	X -4		
9.2	Is an LCS analyzed at the required frequency of one per twenty field samples for each matrix?	\$ ( <b>X</b> )		
9.3	Are all LCS %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria specified in the QAPP?	S.C.	х	
9.4	If Level IV, verify the % recoveries are calculated correctly.			Х
	Action for specific compound outside the acceptance criteria: %R>UCL,			
	J(+) only; $<$ LCL, $J(+)/UJ(-)$ ; $<$ 30% $J(+)/R(-)$ . RPD failures should be flagged "J" (+ only)			

Note: Dichlorodifluoromethane (Freon 12) had a LCS recovery (62%) outside of evaluation criteria (70-130%). Analytes that required qualification due to LCS recoveries are located in the table below:

Field ID	Analyte(s)	Qualification 🐙	Code :	Batch #	Justification 💝 🚞
VI-4-A	Freon 12	UJ	L	t14l0921b	Low LCS recovery
VI-4-B	Freon 12	บัง	L	t14l0921b	Low LCS recovery
VI-3-A	Freon 12	J	L	t14l0921b	Low LCS recovery

#### 10.0 Internal Standards (Code I)

					Yes	No	NA
10.1	Are internal stan	dard areas for every sample a	and blank within upper and	lower QC limits?	X		
		Area > +100%	Area < -50%	Area < -10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			
Note:	calibration, not sample to continuing calibration. Thus, if all other QC specifications are met for a give sample, using informed professional judgment, the reviewer may choose not to flag individual samples this case.						
10.2	Action: The chr	nes of internal standards with omatogram must be examine nagnitude, the reviewer may of action.	d to determine if any false p	ositives or negatives exist.			

Note: Internal standard area counts and retention times were within evaluation criteria.

11.0 TCL Identification (Code W)		Yes	No	NA
lt e	Is the relative retention time (RRT) of each reported compound within 0.06 RRT units of the standard RRT in the continuing calibration?			x
	Are the three ions of greatest intensity present in the standard mass spectrum also present in the sample mass spectrum; and do sample and standard relative ion intensities agree within 30%?			х

Note:

12.0 TCL/	TIC Quantitation and Reported Detection limits (Code K)	Yes	No	NA
12.1	Are RLs used consistent with those specified in the QAPP?	1. 1.7		X
12.2	Are these limits adjusted to reflect dilutions and/ or percent solids as required?	ANY S		х
12.3	Are TIC ions greater than ten percent in the reference spectrum also present in the sample spectrum?			X
12.4	Are any positives reported that exceed the linear range of the instrument? If yes, than flag "J".		<b>4.</b> 33	X
12.5	If Level IV, calculate a sample of positive results to verify correct calculations			х
Note:			<del>-</del>	

.0 Field	Duplicate Samples (Code F)	Yes	No	NA
13.1	Were any field duplicates submitted for VOC analysis?	0.000	X	
13.2	Were all RPD or absolute difference values within the control limits outlined in the QAPP?	TO SERVICE SER	<del></del>	х
	Action: No qualifying action is taken based on field duplicate results, however the data validator should			
	provide a qualitative assessment in the data validation report.			
Note:	Field duplicate samples were not submitted for analysis.			

#### 14.0 Data Completeness

		Yes	No	NA
Is % completeness within the control limits? (Control limit: Check QAPP)	or use 95% for aqueous	X		
Number of samples:	4			
Number of target compounds in each analysis:	60			
Number of results rejected and not reported:	0	$\neg$		
% Completeness = $100 \times ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)$				
% Completeness	100	$\Box$		
	Number of samples:  Number of target compounds in each analysis:  Number of results rejected and not reported:  % Completeness = 100 x ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)	Number of target compounds in each analysis:  Number of results rejected and not reported:  Completeness = 100 x ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)	Is % completeness within the control limits? (Control limit: Check QAPP or use 95% for aqueous Number of samples:    Number of target compounds in each analysis:   Number of results rejected and not reported:   % Completeness = 100 x ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)	Is % completeness within the control limits? (Control limit: Check QAPP or use 95% for aqueous   Number of samples: 4   Number of target compounds in each analysis: 60   Number of results rejected and not reported: 0   % Completeness = 100 x ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)

# DATA VALIDA. JN WORKSHEET VOLATILE ORGANIC ANALYSIS

Reviewer:	Steve Gragert		Project Name:	Sauget - Area 2 Air Sampling
Date:	11/14/2007		Project Number:	21561683.80012
Laboratory	Air Toxics		SDG No.:	0709528
			Review Level:	Level III
Major Anome	olies:		•	
=	No samples were rejected			
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Minor Anome	olies:			•
	Samples were qualified "J/UJ" due to l	low LCS recovery.		
Field IDs:	VI-3-B	VI-4-D		
	VI-3-C	VI-4-E		
	VI-4-C	VI-4-C DUP		

# 1.0 Chain of Custody/Sample Condition

		Yes	No	NA
1.1	Do Chain-of-Custody forms list all samples analyzed?	X		
1.2	Are all Chain-of-Custody forms signed, indicating sample chain-of-custody was maintained?	<b>X</b>		
1.3	Do the Traffic Reports, chain-of-custody, and lab narrative indicate any problems with sample receipt, condition of samples, analytical problems or special circumstances affecting the quality of the data?		x	

Note: No issues were noted in the laboratory case narrative or cooler receipt forms.

# 2.0 Holding Time/ Preservation (Code H)

		Yes	No	NA
2.1	Do sample preservation, collection and storage condition meet method requirement?	-X		
	If sample preservation and/or temperature was inappropriate (i.e., <2°>6°C, etc.), comment in report. unpreserved or temperature is outside the range 0° (but not frozen) to 10° flag all positive results with "J" and all non-detects "UJ". If temperature exceeds 10°, flag positive detections "J" and non-detects "R".			
2.2	Have any technical holding times, determined from sampling to date of analysis, been exceeded? If ye $J(+)/UJ(-)$ .	S,	i x	
	Matrix Preserved Holding Time			
	Air No 14 days			
2.3	Have any technical holding times been grossly (twice the holding time) exceeded? If yes, J(+)/R(-).		× X	

Note: All holding time criteria were met.

	·	Yes	No	NA_
3.1	Are GC/MS Tuning and Mass Calibration forms present for bromofluorobenzene (BFB)?	7 7 7		Х
3.2	Have all samples been analyzed within twelve hours of the BFB tune? If no, flag R.	5 47 5 47		х
3.3	Have ion abundance criteria for BFB been met for each instrument used? If no, flag R.	77.5		х

Note:

#### 4.0 Blanks (Method Blanks, Field Blanks and Trip Blanks)

(Code X - Field Blank Contamination, Code Y - Trip blank contamination, Code Z - Method blank contamination)

		Yes	No	NA
4.1	Is a Method Blank Summary form present for each batch?	X		
4.2	Do any method blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		. X	·
4.3	Do any field/trip rinse/equipment blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?			х
	Action: Positive sample results <5X (or 10X for common volatile lab contaminants- methylene chloride, acetone, and 2-butanone) the blank concentration should be qualified "U". The result should be elevated to the RL for estimate (laboratory "J" flagged) concentrations.			
4.4	If Level IV, review raw data and verify all detections for blanks were reported.			X

Note: All blank

All blank criteria were met.

#### 5.0 GC/MS Initial Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
5.1	Are Initial Calibration summary forms present and complete for each instrument used?			Х
5.2	Are CCCs linear applying either %RSD < 30% and all other compounds <15% or >0.990?	772		х
	If not, J(+)/ UJ(-). In extreme cases, the reviewer may flag non-detects "R".			
5.3	Do any SPCC compounds have an RRF less than specification or any other compounds < 0.05 (use 0.01			·
	for poor responders like ketones or alcohols)? If yes, J(+)/R(-).			x
5.4	Is the lowest standard at the same concentration, or lower, as the RL reported? If not, elevate RL.	1.53		X
5.5	If Level IV, recalculate a sample of RRFs and %RSDs to verify correct calculations are being made.			х

Note:

#### 6.0 Continuing Calibration (Code C)

		Yes _	No	NA
6,1	Are Continuing Calibration Summary forms present and complete?			х
6.2	Has a continuing calibration standard been analyzed every 12 hours?			х
6.3	Have all SPCCs and CCCs met method specifications? If not, comment in report, proceed to 6.4.			X
6.4	Do any compounds have a % difference (or % drift for quantitation from a curve) (%D) between initial and continuing calibration RRF outside QC limits (%D < 20%)?			x
	If yes, a marginal increase in response >20% then $J(+)$ only; a decrease in response then $J(+)/UJ(-)$ . For %D > 50%, flag R.			
6.5	Do any compounds have an RRF < 0.05 (use 0.01 for poor responders)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$ .			x
6.6	If Level IV, calculate a sample of RFs and %Ds from ave RF to verify correct calculations.		<u> </u>	x

#### 7.0 Surrogate Recovery (Code S)

					Yes	No	NA
7.1	Are all sampl	es listed on the app	ropriate Surrogate Recovery Sur	mmary Form ?	$\hat{r}^{*}\hat{\varphi}^{*}\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\hat{r}^{*}}$		
7.2	Are surrogate	recoveries within	acceptance criteria specified in t	he QAPP for all samples?	i x		
7.3	If No in Secti	on 7.2, were these	sample(s) or method blank(s) re	analyzed?			х
7.4	If No in Secti	on 7.3, is any samp	ole dilution factor greater than 10	0? (Surrogate recoveries may l	oe diluted	,	
	out.)						х
	Note: If SMC recoveries do not meet acceptance criteria in samples chosen for the MS/MSD or diluted						
		> UCL	10% to LCL	< 10%			
	Positive	J	· J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			

Note: All surrogate recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

# 8.0 Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate (MS/MSD) or one MS with a Sample Duplicate (Recovery - Code M, RPD - Code D)

		Yes	No	NA
8.1	Is a Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate recovery form present?		х	
8.2	Are MS/MSDs analyzed at the required frequency of one matrix spike per ten samples and a duplicate per twenty for each matrix?			x
8.3	Are all MS/MSD %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria Specified in the QAPP?	第27月6		х
	Using informed professional judgment, the data reviewer should use the MS and MSD results in conjunction with other QC criteria and determine the need for qualification of the data for samples from the same site/matrix. Recoveries <10% may require rejection. RPD failures may be flagged "J" (+			

Note: MS/MSD samples were not submitted for analysis.

# 9.0 Laboratory Control Sample (LCS/LCSD) (Recovery - Code L, RPD - Code E)

		Yes	No	NA
9.1	Is an LCS recovery form present?	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
9.2	Is an LCS analyzed at the required frequency of one per twenty field samples for each matrix?			
9.3	Are all LCS %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria specified in the QAPP?		X	
9.4	If Level IV, verify the % recoveries are calculated correctly.			х
	Action for specific compound outside the acceptance criteria: %R>UCL,			
	J(+) only; <lcl, <math="">J(+)/UJ(-); &lt;30% <math>J(+)/R(-)</math>. RPD failures should be flagged "J" (+ only)</lcl,>			

Note: Dichlorodifluoromethane (Freon 12) had a LCS recovery (62%) outside of evaluation criteria (70-130%). Analytes that required qualification due to LCS recoveries are located in the table below:

Field ID	A ELECTRICAL STATE OF	Qualification	- Ha"√Code K4	###### Batch####################################	Justification
VI-3-B	Freon 12	J	L	t1410921b	Low LCS recovery
VI-3-C	Freon 12	UJ	L	t14l0921b	Low LCS recovery
VI-4-C	Freon 12	J	L	t1410921b	Low LCS recovery
VI-4-C DUP	Freon 12	J	L	t1410921b	Low LCS recovery
VI-4-D	Freon 12	UJ	L	t1410921b	Low LCS recovery
VI-4-E	Freon 12	UJ	L	t1410921b	Low LCS recovery

# 10.0 Internal Standards (Code I)

					Yes	No	NA
10.1	Are internal stan	dard areas for every sample a	and blank within upper and	lower QC limits?	or early		
		Area > +100%	Area < -50%	Area < -10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			
Note:		sample to continuing calibrati formed professional judgmen			es in		
10.2		nes of internal standards with			X ×		<u> </u>
	Action: The chromatogram must be examined to determine if any false positives or negatives exist. For shift of a large magnitude, the reviewer may consider partial or total rejection of the data for non-detects						
	in that sample/fr	action.					

Note: Internal standard area counts and retention times were within evaluation criteria.

11.0 TCL Id	lentification (Code W)	Yes	No	NA
	Is the relative retention time (RRT) of each reported compound within 0.06 RRT units of the standard RRT in the continuing calibration?		·	х
11	Are the three ions of greatest intensity present in the standard mass spectrum also present in the sample mass spectrum; and do sample and standard relative ion intensities agree within 30%?			х

Note:

12.0 TCL/	TIC Quantitation and Reported Detection limits (Code K)	Yes	No	NA
12.1	Are RLs used consistent with those specified in the QAPP?	The second		x
12.2	Are these limits adjusted to reflect dilutions and/ or percent solids as required?	2007		Х
12.3	Are TIC ions greater than ten percent in the reference spectrum also present in the sample spectrum?	40.000		Х
12.4	Are any positives reported that exceed the linear range of the instrument? If yes, than flag "J".		(The said	Х
12.5	If Level IV, calculate a sample of positive results to verify correct calculations			х
Note:				

.0 Field	Duplicate Samples (Code F)	Yes	No	NA
13.1	Were any field duplicates submitted for VOC analysis?	7 X		
13.2	Were all RPD or absolute difference values within the control limits outlined in the QAPP?	X		
	Action: No qualifying action is taken based on field duplicate results, however the data validator should			
	provide a qualitative assessment in the data validation report.			
Note:	Sample VI-4-C-DUP was the field duplicate for sample VI-4-C.			

# 14.0 Data Completeness

			Yes	No	N
14.1	Is % completeness within the control limits? (Control limit: Check Q	APP or use 95% for aqueous	Trees.		
14.2	Number of samples:	6			
14.3	Number of target compounds in each analysis:	60			
14.4	Number of results rejected and not reported:	0			
	% Completeness = $100 \times ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)$				
	% Completeness	100			

# DATA VALID. N WORKSHEET VOLATILE ORGANIC ANALYSIS

Reviewer:	Steve Gragert Project Name:	Sauget -	Area 2 Air S	Sampling
Date:	11/14/2007 Project Number:	215	61683.800	)12
Laboratory			0709557	
_	Review Level:		Level III	
Major Anom	olies:		-	
	No samples were rejected			
Minor Anom	olies:			
	Samples were qualified "U" due to field blank contamination. Samples were also qualified "J" due to high surrogate recovery.			
Field IDs:	VI-5-A			
	VI-5-B			
	VI-5-C			
	VI-092507-FB			
1.0 Chain of	Custody/Sample Condition			
~		Yes	No	NA
1.1	Do Chain-of-Custody forms list all samples analyzed?	x x		
1.2	Are all Chain-of-Custody forms signed, indicating sample chain-of-custody was maintained?	.5 · X		
1.3	Do the Traffic Reports, chain-of-custody, and lab narrative indicate any problems with sample receipt,			
	condition of samples, analytical problems or special circumstances affecting the quality of the data?		X	
Note:	The laboratory case narrative inidacted surrogate recovery was outside evaluation criteria for TO-15 full scan and TO-15 SIM.	No other i	ssues were no	oted
	in the case narrative or cooler receipt forms.			
2.0 Holding	Time/ Preservation (Code H)		г :: т	
<del></del>		Yes	No	NA_
2.1	Do sample preservation, collection and storage condition meet method requirement?	X X	<u></u>	
	If sample preservation and/or temperature was inappropriate (i.e., <2° >6°C, etc.), comment in report. If			
	unpreserved or temperature is outside the range 0° (but not frozen) to 10° flag all positive results with a			
	"J" and all non-detects "UJ". If temperature exceeds 10°, flag positive detections "J" and non-detects	]		
	"R".			
2.2	Have any technical holding times, determined from sampling to date of analysis, been exceeded? If yes,			
	J(+)/UJ(-).		X	
	Matrix Preserved Holding Time			
<del></del>	Air No 14 days  Have any technical holding times been grossly (twice the holding time) exceeded? If yes, J(+)/R(-).		Teaster transist	
2.3	priave any reconneal nothing times been grossly (twice the nothing time) exceeded? If yes, J(+)/R(-).	1	X	

Note:

All holding time criteria were met.

		Yes	No	NA
3.1	Are GC/MS Tuning and Mass Calibration forms present for bromofluorobenzene (BFB)?	76.4		Х
3.2	Have all samples been analyzed within twelve hours of the BFB tune? If no, flag R.	al and a contract of		X
3.3	Have ion abundance criteria for BFB been met for each instrument used? If no, flag R.			Х

Note:

#### 4.0 Blanks (Method Blanks, Field Blanks and Trip Blanks)

(Code X - Field Blank Contamination, Code Y - Trip blank contamination, Code Z - Method blank contamination)

			Yes	No	NA
4	l. I	Is a Method Blank Summary form present for each batch?	**X		
4	1.2	Do any method blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		(A)	
. 4	1.3	Do any field/trip rinse/equipment blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		-x	
		Action: Positive sample results <5X (or 10X for common volatile lab contaminants- methylene chloride, acetone, and 2-butanone) the blank concentration should be qualified "U". The result should be elevated to the RL for estimate (laboratory "J" flagged) concentrations.			
4	1,4	If Level IV, review raw data and verify all detections for blanks were reported.			Х

Note:

Field Blank VI-092507-FB had detections of the following analytes (in µg/m³): Ethanol (1.8), Acetone (13), 2-Butanone (10), Benzene

(0.58), Toluene (2.0), m,p-Xylene (1.4), o-Xylene (0.70), 4-Ethyltoluene (0.98), and 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene (1.5).

Analytes that required qualification due to Field Blank detections are located in the table below:

Field ID	Analyte(s)	Qualification	Code		3 Justification 11 Ct
VI-5-A	m&p-Xylene	U	Х	t14l0921b	Field Blank contamination
VI-5-A	4-Ethyltoluene	U	Х	t14l0921b	Field Blank contamination
VI-5-B	2-Butanone	U	Х	t14l0921b	Field Blank contamination
VI-5-C	2-Butanone	U	Х	114109216	Field Blank contamination
VI-5-C	m&p-Xylene	U	х	t14l0921b	Field Blank contamination
VI-5-C	o-Xylene	U	х	t14l0921b	Field Blank contamination
VI-5-C	4-Ethyltoluene	U	Х	t14l0921b	Field Blank contamination
VI-5-C	1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	U	Х	t14l0921b	Field Blank contamination

#### 5.0 GC/MS Initial Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
5.1	Are Initial Calibration summary forms present and complete for each instrument used?			Х
5.2	Are CCCs linear applying either %RSD < 30% and all other compounds <15% or >0.990?	200		х
	If not, J(+)/ UJ(-). In extreme cases, the reviewer may flag non-detects "R".			
5.3	Do any SPCC compounds have an RRF less than specification or any other compounds < 0.05 (use 0.01		3-3-4	
	for poor responders like ketones or alcohols)? If yes, J(+)/R(-).	<u> </u>		X
5.4	Is the lowest standard at the same concentration, or lower, as the RL reported? If not, elevate RL.			х
5.5	If Level IV, recalculate a sample of RRFs and %RSDs to verify correct calculations are being made.			х

#### 6.0 Continuing Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
6.1	Are Continuing Calibration Summary forms present and complete?	100		х
6.2	Has a continuing calibration standard been analyzed every 12 hours?			X
6.3	Have all SPCCs and CCCs met method specifications? If not, comment in report, proceed to 6.4.	相知工		х
6.4	Do any compounds have a % difference (or % drift for quantitation from a curve) (%D) between initial and continuing calibration RRF outside QC limits (%D < 20%)?			x
	If yes, a marginal increase in response >20% then $J(+)$ only; a decrease in response then $J(+)/UJ(-)$ . For %D > 50%, flag R.			
6.5	Do any compounds have an RRF < 0.05 (use 0.01 for poor responders)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$ .			x
6.6	If Level IV, calculate a sample of RFs and %Ds from ave RF to verify correct calculations.			х

Note:

# 7.0 Surrogate Recovery (Code S)

_	•				Yes	No	NA
7.1	Are all sampl	es listed on the ap	propriate Surrogate Recovery Sur	mmary Form ?	X.		
7.2			acceptance criteria specified in t		<b>第</b> 34	x	
7.3	If No in Section 7.2, were these sample(s) or method blank(s) reanalyzed?				х		
7.4	If No in Sectiout.)	on 7.3, is any sam	ple dilution factor greater than 10	0? (Surrogate recoveries may	be diluted	x	
	1	C recoveries do no no reanalysis is re	t meet acceptance criteria in samequired.	ples chosen for the MS/MSD	or diluted		
		> UCL	10% to LCL	< 10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			

Note: In sample VI-5-C, the surrogate 1,2-Dichloroethane-d4 had a recovery (193%) outside of evaluation criteria (70-130%) in both full scan and SIM.

Analytes that required qualification due to surrogate recovery are located in the table below:

Field ID	Analyte(s)	Par Qualification	ode/tel # ###.		A Dec Tustification
VI-5-C	All TO-15 full scan detections	J	S	y100315	High surrogate recovery
VI-5-C	All TO-15 SIM detections	J	S	a100410	High surrogate recovery

#### 8.0 Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate (MS/MSD) or one MS with a Sample Duplicate (Recovery - Code M, RPD - Code D)

		Yes	No	NA
8.1	Is a Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate recovery form present?	30/200	Х	
8.2	Are MS/MSDs analyzed at the required frequency of one matrix spike per ten samples and a duplicate per twenty for each matrix?			x
8.3	Are all MS/MSD %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria Specified in the QAPP?			х
	Using informed professional judgment, the data reviewer should use the MS and MSD results in conjunction with other QC criteria and determine the need for qualification of the data for samples from the same site/matrix. Recoveries <10% may require rejection. RPD failures may be flagged "J" (+			

Note: MS/MSD samples were not submitted for analysis.

#### 9.0 Laboratory Control Sample (LCS/LCSD) (Recovery - Code L, ... D - Code E)

		Yes	No	NA
9.1	Is an LCS recovery form present?	X X		
9.2	Is an LCS analyzed at the required frequency of one per twenty field samples for each matrix?	7 × X		
9.3	Are all LCS %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria specified in the QAPP?	0.443.00		
9.4	If Level IV, verify the % recoveries are calculated correctly.			х
	Action for specific compound outside the acceptance criteria: %R>UCL,			
	J(+) only; $<$ LCL, $J(+)/UJ(-)$ ; $<$ 30% $J(+)/R(-)$ . RPD failures should be flagged "J" $(+$ only)			

Note: All LCS recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

#### 10.0 Internal Standards (Code I)

					Yes	No	NA
10.1	Are internal stan	ndard areas for every sample a	and blank within upper and	lower QC limits?	X		
		Area > +100%	Area < -50%	Area < -10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			
Note:		sample to continuing calibrati formed professional judgmen					
10.2		nes of internal standards with			x X		
	Action: The chromatogram must be examined to determine if any false positives or negatives exist. For shift of a large magnitude, the reviewer may consider partial or total rejection of the data for non-detects in that sample/fraction.				1		

Note: Internal standard area counts and retention times were within evaluation criteria.

11.0 TCL Id	11.0 TCL Identification (Code W)			NA
11.1	Is the relative retention time (RRT) of each reported compound within 0.06 RRT units of the standard RRT in the continuing calibration?			x
11.2	Are the three ions of greatest intensity present in the standard mass spectrum also present in the sample mass spectrum; and do sample and standard relative ion intensities agree within 30%?			х

12.0 TCL/	TIC Quantitation and Reported Detection limits (Code K)	Yes	No	NA
12.1	Are RLs used consistent with those specified in the QAPP?	12 7000		Х
12.2	Are these limits adjusted to reflect dilutions and/ or percent solids as required?			X
12.3	Are TIC ions greater than ten percent in the reference spectrum also present in the sample spectrum?	St. Carrier		X
12.4	Are any positives reported that exceed the linear range of the instrument? If yes, than flag "J".			X
12.5	If Level IV, calculate a sample of positive results to verify correct calculations			х
Note:		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		

13.0 Field	Duplicate Samples (Code F)	Yes	No	NA
13.1	Were any field duplicates submitted for VOC analysis?	71282K	X	
13.2	Were all RPD or absolute difference values within the control limits outlined in the QAPP?			х
	Action: No qualifying action is taken based on field duplicate results, however the data validator should			•
	provide a qualitative assessment in the data validation report.			
Note:	Field duplicate samples were not submitted for analysis.			

# 14.0 Data Completeness

			Yes	No	NA
14.1	Is % completeness within the control limits? (Control limit: Check QAF	PP or use 95% for aqueous	TO X		
14.2	Number of samples:	4			
14.3	Number of target compounds in each analysis:	60			
14.4	Number of results rejected and not reported:	0			
	% Completeness = $100 \times ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)$				
	% Completeness	100			÷

# DATA VALIDA N WORKSHEET VOLATILE ORGANIC ANALYSIS

Reviewer: Date:		Sauget - Area 2 Air Sampling 21561683.80012				
Laboratory	o.: 0709576					
Dabbiatory	Air Toxics SDG No.: Review Level:		Level III			
Major Anom				<del></del>		
•	No samples were rejected					
Minor Anom	olies:					
	No analytes required qualification based on this data review.					
				-		
Field IDs:	VI-10-A					
	VI-6-A					
	VI-12-A					
1.0 Chain of	Custody/Sample Condition	Yes	No	NA		
1.1	Do Chain-of-Custody forms list all samples analyzed?	Y				
1.2	Are all Chain-of-Custody forms signed, indicating sample chain-of-custody was maintained?	x				
1.3	Do the Traffic Reports, chain-of-custody, and lab narrative indicate any problems with sample receipt,		0.000			
	condition of samples, analytical problems or special circumstances affecting the quality of the data?		T X			
Note:	The laboratory case narrative and cooler receipt form did not indicate any problems.					
7.000	The laboratory base in the area cook records to the intrinsical way provided					
2.0 Holding	Time/ Preservation (Code H)		•			
		Yes	No	NA		
2.1	Do sample preservation, collection and storage condition meet method requirement?	X .				
	If sample preservation and/or temperature was inappropriate (i.e., <2° >6°C, etc.), comment in report. If					
	unpreserved or temperature is outside the range 0° (but not frozen) to 10° flag all positive results with a					
	"J" and all non-detects "UJ". If temperature exceeds 10°, flag positive detections "J" and non-detects					
	"R".	<u> </u>				
2.2	Have any technical holding times, determined from sampling to date of analysis, been exceeded? If yes, $J(+)/UJ(-)$ .		X			
	Matrix Preserved Holding Time					
	Air No 14 days		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
2.3	Have any technical holding times been grossly (twice the holding time) exceeded? If yes, J(+)/R(-).		**X***			
Note:	All holding time criteria were met.					

		Yes No	n NA
3.1	Are GC/MS Tuning and Mass Calibration forms present for bromofluorobenzene (BFB)?	<b>S02</b> (2) *******	x
3.2	Have all samples been analyzed within twelve hours of the BFB tune? If no, flag R.		x
3.3	Have ion abundance criteria for BFB been met for each instrument used? If no, flag R.		X

Note:

#### 4.0 Blanks (Method Blanks, Field Blanks and Trip Blanks)

(Code X - Field Blank Contamination, Code Y - Trip blank contamination, Code Z - Method blank contamination)

		Yes	No	NA
4.1	Is a Method Blank Summary form present for each batch?	X		
4.2	Do any method blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		X	
4.3	Do any field/trip rinse/equipment blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		2.5122°48	x
	Action: Positive sample results <5X (or 10X for common volatile lab contaminants- methylene chloride, acetone, and 2-butanone) the blank concentration should be qualified "U". The result should be elevated to the RL for estimate (laboratory "J" flagged) concentrations.	1		
4.4	If Level IV, review raw data and verify all detections for blanks were reported.			х

Note: All blank criteria were met.

#### 5.0 GC/MS Initial Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
5.1	Are Initial Calibration summary forms present and complete for each instrument used?	\$10.77		х
5.2	Are CCCs linear applying either %RSD < 30% and all other compounds <15% or >0.990?			Х
	If not, J(+)/UJ(-). In extreme cases, the reviewer may flag non-detects "R".			
5.3	Do any SPCC compounds have an RRF less than specification or any other compounds < 0.05 (use 0.01		Market II (1) Report Trees	
	for poor responders like ketones or alcohols)? If yes, J(+)/R(-).			X
5.4	Is the lowest standard at the same concentration, or lower, as the RL reported? If not, elevate RL.	7		х
5.5	If Level IV, recalculate a sample of RRFs and %RSDs to verify correct calculations are being made.			Х

Note:

#### 6.0 Continuing Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
6.1	Are Continuing Calibration Summary forms present and complete?			х
6.2	Has a continuing calibration standard been analyzed every 12 hours?			х
6.3	Have all SPCCs and CCCs met method specifications? If not, comment in report, proceed to 6.4.	W-75-7		х
6.4	Do any compounds have a % difference (or % drift for quantitation from a curve) (%D) between initial and continuing calibration RRF outside QC limits (%D < 20%)?			x
	If yes, a marginal increase in response >20% then $J(+)$ only; a decrease in response then $J(+)/UJ(-)$ . For $\%D > 50\%$ , flag R.		-	
6.5	Do any compounds have an RRF < 0.05 (use 0.01 for poor responders)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$ .			х
6.6	If Level IV, calculate a sample of RFs and %Ds from ave RF to verify correct calculations.			Х

#### 7.0 Surrogate Recovery (Code S)

•					Yes	No	NA
7.1	Are all sampl	es listed on the app	propriate Surrogate Recovery Sun	nmary Form ?	**·X**		
7.2					X X X		
7.3	If No in Secti	on 7.2, were these	sample(s) or method blank(s) rea	nalyzed?			х
7.4	If No in Secti	on 7.3, is any samp	ple dilution factor greater than 10	? (Surrogate recoveries may	be diluted		x
	Note: If SMO	C recoveries do not	meet acceptance criteria in samp	les chosen for the MS/MSD	or diluted		
		> UCL	10% to LCL	< 10%			÷
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			

Note: All surrogate recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

#### 8.0 Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate (MS/MSD) or one MS with a Sample Duplicate (Recovery - Code M, RPD - Code D)

		Yes	No	NA
8.1	Is a Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate recovery form present?	<b>302</b>	X	
8.2	Are MS/MSDs analyzed at the required frequency of one matrix spike per ten samples and a duplicate per twenty for each matrix?			x
8.3	Are all MS/MSD %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria Specified in the QAPP?	566		x
	Using informed professional judgment, the data reviewer should use the MS and MSD results in conjunction with other QC criteria and determine the need for qualification of the data for samples from the same site/matrix. Recoveries <10% may require rejection. RPD failures may be flagged "J" (+			

Note: MS/MSD samples were not submitted for analysis.

#### 9.0 Laboratory Control Sample (LCS/LCSD) (Recovery - Code L, RPD - Code E)

		Yes	No	NA
9.1	Is an LCS recovery form present?	ey x		
9.2	Is an LCS analyzed at the required frequency of one per twenty field samples for each matrix?	X		
9.3	Are all LCS %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria specified in the QAPP?	X		
9.4	If Level IV, verify the % recoveries are calculated correctly.			х
	Action for specific compound outside the acceptance criteria: %R>UCL,			
	J(+) only; $<$ LCL, $J(+)/UJ(-)$ ; $<$ 30% $J(+)/R(-)$ . RPD failures should be flagged "J" (+ only)			

Note: All LCS recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

# 10.0 Internal Standards (Code I)

					Yes	No	NA
10.1	Are internal star	dard areas for every sample a	and blank within upper and	lower QC limits?	<b>x</b> ::		
		Area > +100%	Area < -50%	Area < -10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			
Note:	calibration, not sample to continuing calibration. Thus, if all other QC specifications are met for a given sample, using informed professional judgment, the reviewer may choose not to flag individual samples in this case.				les in		
10.2	Action: The chr	nes of internal standards with romatogram must be examine nagnitude, the reviewer may of	d to determine if any false p	ositives or negatives exist.			

Note: Internal standard area counts and retention times were within evaluation criteria.

11.0 TCL Identification (Code W)				NA
11.1	Is the relative retention time (RRT) of each reported compound within 0.06 RRT units of the standard	340 E		
	RRT in the continuing calibration?	72 A 34		х
11.2	Are the three ions of greatest intensity present in the standard mass spectrum also present in the sample			
	mass spectrum; and do sample and standard relative ion intensities agree within 30%?			x

Note:

12.0 TCL/	TIC Quantitation and Reported Detection limits (Code K)	Yes	No	NA
12.1	Are RLs used consistent with those specified in the QAPP?			x
12.2	Are these limits adjusted to reflect dilutions and/ or percent solids as required?			x
12.3	Are TIC ions greater than ten percent in the reference spectrum also present in the sample spectrum?	0.60		х
12.4	Are any positives reported that exceed the linear range of the instrument? If yes, than flag "J".		Marie T.	х
12.5	If Level IV, calculate a sample of positive results to verify correct calculations			х

Note:

13.0 F	13.0 Field Duplicate Samples (Code F)			No	NA
13	3,1	Were any field duplicates submitted for VOC analysis?		х	
13	3.2	Were all RPD or absolute difference values within the control limits outlined in the QAPP?			х
		Action: No qualifying action is taken based on field duplicate results, however the data validator should			
		provide a qualitative assessment in the data validation report.			

Note: Field duplicate samples were not submitted for analysis.

# 14.0 Data Completeness

			Yes	No	NA
14.1	Is % completeness within the control limits? (Control limit: Check QAPP or use 95% for aqu	eous	X		
14.2	Number of samples: 3				
14.3	Number of target compounds in each analysis: 60				
14.4	Number of results rejected and not reported: 0				
	% Completeness = $100 \times ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)$				
	% Completeness 100				

# DATA VALIDA N WORKSHEET VOLATILE ORGANIC ANALYSIS

Reviewer:	Steve Gragert Project Name:	Sauget -	Area 2 Air	Sampling
Date:	11/14/2007 Project Number:	215	61683.80	012
Laboratory	Air Toxics SDG No.:		0709608	
·	Review Level:		Level III	
Major Anom	olies:			
·	No samples were rejected			
•				
Minor Anom	olies:			
	No analytes required qualification based on this data review.			
Field IDs:	VI-10-D			
	•			
1.0 Chain of	Custody/Sample Condition			
		Yes	No	NA
1.1	Do Chain-of-Custody forms list all samples analyzed?	X.		
1.2	Are all Chain-of-Custody forms signed, indicating sample chain-of-custody was maintained?	X		
1.3	Do the Traffic Reports, chain-of-custody, and lab narrative indicate any problems with sample receipt,			
	condition of samples, analytical problems or special circumstances affecting the quality of the data?		X Table	
Note:	No issues were noted in the laboratory case narrative or cooler receipt forms.			
				<u> </u>
2.0 Holding	Time/ Preservation (Code H)		<del>,</del>	
		Yes	No	NA
2.1	Do sample preservation, collection and storage condition meet method requirement?	X		
	If sample preservation and/or temperature was inappropriate (i.e., <2° >6°C, etc.), comment in report. If			
	unpreserved or temperature is outside the range 0° (but not frozen) to 10° flag all positive results with a			
	"J" and all non-detects "UJ". If temperature exceeds 10°, flag positive detections "J" and non-detects			
	"R".			
2.2	Have any technical holding times, determined from sampling to date of analysis, been exceeded? If yes,		The Control	
	J(+)/UJ(-).	<u> </u>	X X	
	Matrix Preserved Holding Time			
	Air No 14 days			
2.3	Have any technical holding times been grossly (twice the holding time) exceeded? If yes, J(+)/R(-).	<u> </u>	X X	
Note:	All holding time criteria were met.		:	*

		Yes	No	NA
3.1	Are GC/MS Tuning and Mass Calibration forms present for bromofluorobenzene (BFB)?	<b>6</b> 46 - 6		Х
3.2	Have all samples been analyzed within twelve hours of the BFB tune? If no, flag R.	3.75.100		х
3.3	Have ion abundance criteria for BFB been met for each instrument used? If no, flag R.	27.42.23		x

Note:

#### 4.0 Blanks (Method Blanks, Field Blanks and Trip Blanks)

(Code X - Field Blank Contamination, Code Y - Trip blank contamination, Code Z - Method blank contamination)

			Yes	No	NA
	4.1	Is a Method Blank Summary form present for each batch?	T. X		
	4.2	Do any method blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		<b>X</b>	
i.	4.3	Do any field/trip rinse/equipment blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		X	
		Action: Positive sample results <5X (or 10X for common volatile lab contaminants- methylene chloride, acetone, and 2-butanone) the blank concentration should be qualified "U". The result should be elevated to the RL for estimate (laboratory "J" flagged) concentrations.			
	4.4	If Level IV, review raw data and verify all detections for blanks were reported.			Х

Note: All blank criteria were met.

#### 5.0 GC/MS Initial Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
5.1	Are Initial Calibration summary forms present and complete for each instrument used?	25,00200		Х
5.2	Are CCCs linear applying either %RSD < 30% and all other compounds <15% or >0.990?			Х
	If not, J(+)/ UJ(-). In extreme cases, the reviewer may flag non-detects "R".			
5.3	Do any SPCC compounds have an RRF less than specification or any other compounds < 0.05 (use 0.01)			
	for poor responders like ketones or alcohols)? If yes, J(+)/R(-).			х
5.4	Is the lowest standard at the same concentration, or lower, as the RL reported? If not, elevate RL.			х
5.5	If Level IV, recalculate a sample of RRFs and %RSDs to verify correct calculations are being made.			X

Note:

#### 6.0 Continuing Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
6.1	Are Continuing Calibration Summary forms present and complete?			х
6.2	Has a continuing calibration standard been analyzed every 12 hours?	<b>6 *</b> * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *		х
6.3	Have all SPCCs and CCCs met method specifications? If not, comment in report, proceed to 6.4.	77.00		х
6.4	Do any compounds have a % difference (or % drift for quantitation from a curve) (%D) between initial and continuing calibration RRF outside QC limits (%D < 20%)?			x
	If yes, a marginal increase in response >20% then $J(+)$ only; a decrease in response then $J(+)/UJ(-)$ . For $D > 50\%$ , flag R.			
6.5	Do any compounds have an RRF < 0.05 (use 0.01 for poor responders)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$ .		20.00	х
6.6	If Level IV, calculate a sample of RFs and %Ds from ave RF to verify correct calculations.	,		X

2of4

#### 7.0 Surrogate Recovery (Code S)

					Yes	No	NA
7.1	Are all sampl	les listed on the app	propriate Surrogate Recovery Sur	nmary Form ?	X		
7.2	Are surrogate	recoveries within	acceptance criteria specified in t	he QAPP for all samples?	T.X.		
7.3	If No in Secti	ion 7.2, were these	sample(s) or method blank(s) re	analyzed?			х
7.4	If No in Sect	ion 7.3, is any sam	ple dilution factor greater than 10	? (Surrogate recoveries may b	oe diluted		
	out.)						х
	Note: If SM	C recoveries do not	meet acceptance criteria in sam	oles chosen for the MS/MSD o	r diluted		
		> UCL	10% to LCL	< 10%			
	Positive	J	· J	Ј			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R		_	

Note: All surrogate recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

# 8.0 Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate (MS/MSD) or one MS with a Sample Duplicate (Recovery - Code M, RPD - Code D)

		Yes	No	NA
8.1	Is a Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate recovery form present?		Х	
8.2	Are MS/MSDs analyzed at the required frequency of one matrix spike per ten samples and a duplicate per twenty for each matrix?			X
8.3	Are all MS/MSD %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria Specified in the QAPP?			х
	Using informed professional judgment, the data reviewer should use the MS and MSD results in conjunction with other QC criteria and determine the need for qualification of the data for samples from the same site/matrix. Recoveries <10% may require rejection. RPD failures may be flagged "J" (+			

Note: MS/MSD samples were not submitted for analysis.

#### 9.0 Laboratory Control Sample (LCS/LCSD) (Recovery - Code L, RPD - Code E)

		Yes	No	NA
9.1	Is an LCS recovery form present?	i X	_	
9.2	Is an LCS analyzed at the required frequency of one per twenty field samples for each matrix?	THE X PUT	_	
9.3	Are all LCS %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria specified in the QAPP?	X X X A		
9.4	If Level IV, verify the % recoveries are calculated correctly.			Х
	Action for specific compound outside the acceptance criteria: %R>UCL,			
	J(+) only; $<$ LCL, $J(+)/UJ(-)$ ; $<$ 30% $J(+)/R(-)$ . RPD failures should be flagged "J" (+ only)			

Note: All LCS recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

# 10.0 Internal Standards (Code I)

		·			Yes	No	NA
10.1	Are internal stan	dard areas for every sample a	and blank within upper and	lower QC limits?	(ALAX		<u> </u>
		Area > +100%	Area < -50%	Area < -10%			
	Positive	J	Ј	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			
Note:		sample to continuing calibrati formed professional judgmen			les in		
10.2	Action: The chr	nes of internal standards with omatogram must be examine nagnitude, the reviewer may of action.	d to determine if any false p	ositives or negatives exist.			

Note: Internal standard area counts and retention times were within evaluation criteria.

11.0 TCL Identification (Code W)			No	NA
11.1	Is the relative retention time (RRT) of each reported compound within 0.06 RRT units of the standard			
	RRT in the continuing calibration?	4440		X
11.2	Are the three ions of greatest intensity present in the standard mass spectrum also present in the sample			
	mass spectrum; and do sample and standard relative ion intensities agree within 30%?	2000		X

Note:

12.0 TCL/	TIC Quantitation and Reported Detection limits (Code K)	Yes	No	NA
12.1	Are RLs used consistent with those specified in the QAPP?	1000		X
12.2	Are these limits adjusted to reflect dilutions and/ or percent solids as required?	8000		х
12.3	Are TIC ions greater than ten percent in the reference spectrum also present in the sample spectrum?	7/8/XT-3/2		х
12.4	Are any positives reported that exceed the linear range of the instrument? If yes, than flag "J".			х
12.5	If Level IV, calculate a sample of positive results to verify correct calculations			Х
Note:				±

13.0 Field I	13.0 Field Duplicate Samples (Code F)  13.1 Were any field duplicates submitted for VOC analysis?			
13.1	Were any field duplicates submitted for VOC analysis?	K43512.31	X	
13.2	Were all RPD or absolute difference values within the control limits outlined in the QAPP?			х
	Action: No qualifying action is taken based on field duplicate results, however the data validator should			
	provide a qualitative assessment in the data validation report.			

Note: Field duplicate samples were not submitted for analysis.

# 14.0 Data Completeness

			Yes	No	N.
14.1	Is % completeness within the control limits? (Control limit: Check QAPP	or use 95% for aqueous	227 <b>x</b> 255		
14.2	Number of samples:	1			
14.3	Number of target compounds in each analysis:	60			
14.4	Number of results rejected and not reported:	0			
	% Completeness = $100 \times ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)$				
	% Completeness	100			

# DATA VALIDA. N WORKSHEET VOLATILE ORGANIC ANALYSIS

Reviewer:	Steve Gragert	Project Name:	Sauget - Area 2 Air Sampling
Date:	11/14/2007	Project Number:	21561683.80012
Laboratory	Air Toxics	SDG No.:	0709647
٠.	Air Toxics SDG No.: Review Level:  Anomolies: No samples were rejected	Level III	
Major Anomo	olies:	•	
	No samples were rejected		
•			
•			
Minor Anome	olies:		
	Samples were qualified "U" due to	ield blank contamination.	
•	······································		
•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Field IDs:	VI-11-A		
Field IDs:	VI-11-A VI-11-A DUP		
Field IDs:			·

# 1.0 Chain of Custody/Sample Condition

		Yes	No	NA
1.1	Do Chain-of-Custody forms list all samples analyzed?	X		
1.2	Are all Chain-of-Custody forms signed, indicating sample chain-of-custody was maintained?	T X		
1.3	Do the Traffic Reports, chain-of-custody, and lab narrative indicate any problems with sample receipt,			
	condition of samples, analytical problems or special circumstances affecting the quality of the data?	<u> </u>	X	*

Note: The laboratory case narrative and cooler receipt form did not indicate any problems.

# 2.0 Holding Time/ Preservation (Code H)

					Yes	No	NA
2.1	Do sample preser	vation, collection and sto	rage condition meet method requirement	?	X		
	unpreserved or te	mperature is outside the r	was inappropriate (i.e., <2° >6°C, etc.), or ange 0° (but not frozen) to 10° flag all pre exceeds 10°, flag positive detections ".	ositive results with a			
2.2	Have any technic J(+)/UJ(-).	al holding times, determine	ned from sampling to date of analysis, be	een exceeded? If yes,		×	
	Matrix	Preserved	Holding Time				
	Air	No	14 days		1		
2.3	Have any technic	al holding times been gro	ssly (twice the holding time) exceeded?	If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$ .		XX.	

Note:

All holding time criteria were met.

		Yes	No	NA
3.1	Are GC/MS Tuning and Mass Calibration forms present for bromofluorobenzene (BFB)?			Х
3.2	Have all samples been analyzed within twelve hours of the BFB tune? If no, flag R.			х
3.3	Have ion abundance criteria for BFB been met for each instrument used? If no, flag R.			x

Note:

#### 4.0 Blanks (Method Blanks, Field Blanks and Trip Blanks)

(Code X - Field Blank Contamination, Code Y - Trip blank contamination, Code Z - Method blank contamination)

		Yes	No	NA
4.1	Is a Method Blank Summary form present for each batch?	<b>x</b>		
4.2	Do any method blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		Ϋ́X	
4.3	Do any field/trip rinse/equipment blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?	х		
	Action: Positive sample results <5X (or 10X for common volatile lab contaminants- methylene chloride,			
	acetone, and 2-butanone) the blank concentration should be qualified "U". The result should be elevated			
	to the RL for estimate (laboratory "J" flagged) concentrations.			
4.4	If Level IV, review raw data and verify all detections for blanks were reported.			. <b>X</b>

Note:

Field Blank VI-092807-FB had detections of the following analytes (in µg/m³): Ethanol (1.6), Acetone (11), 2-Butanone (6.4), Benzene (0.61), Toluene (2.1), m,p-Xylene (1.2) and Oxygen (20%). Professional judgment was used to not qualify Oxygen due to the fact it is naturally occurring in air.

Analytes that required qualification due to field blank detections are located in the table below:

Field ID.	Analyte(s)	Qualification	Code	Batch#	Justification
VI-11-A	Acetone	U	Х	y1009 <b>2</b> 6	Field Blank contamination
VI-11-A	2-Butanone	U	Х	y100926	Field Blank contamination
VI-11-A	m&p-Xylene	Ŭ	Х	y100926	Field Blank contamination
VI-13-A	2-Butanone	U	X	y100926	Field Blank contamination
VI-13-A	Benzene	U	Х	y100926	Field Blank contamination
VI-13-A	m&p-Xylene	U	Х	y100926	Field Blank contamination

# 5.0 GC/MS Initial Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
5.1	Are Initial Calibration summary forms present and complete for each instrument used?	1440M		Х
5.2	Are CCCs linear applying either %RSD < 30% and all other compounds <15% or >0.990?	02/25/48		X
	If not, J(+)/ UJ(-). In extreme cases, the reviewer may flag non-detects "R".			
5.3	Do any SPCC compounds have an RRF less than specification or any other compounds < 0.05 (use 0.01			
	for poor responders like ketones or alcohols)? If yes, J(+)/R(-).			X
5.4	Is the lowest standard at the same concentration, or lower, as the RL reported? If not, elevate RL.	¥69.00		x
5.5	If Level IV, recalculate a sample of RRFs and %RSDs to verify correct calculations are being made.			x

#### .6.0 Continuing Calibration (Code C)

	·	Yes	No	NA
6.1	Are Continuing Calibration Summary forms present and complete?	MITTER ST		X
6.2	Has a continuing calibration standard been analyzed every 12 hours?	ut.		x
6.3	Have all SPCCs and CCCs met method specifications? If not, comment in report, proceed to 6.4.			x
6.4	Do any compounds have a % difference (or % drift for quantitation from a curve) (%D) between initial and continuing calibration RRF outside QC limits (%D < 20%)?			x
	If yes, a marginal increase in response >20% then $J(+)$ only; a decrease in response then $J(+)/UJ(-)$ . For %D > 50%, flag R.			
6.5	Do any compounds have an RRF < 0.05 (use 0.01 for poor responders)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$ .			X
6.6	If Level IV, calculate a sample of RFs and %Ds from ave RF to verify correct calculations.			х

Note:

#### 7.0 Surrogate Recovery (Code S)

					Yes	No	NA
7.1	Are all sampl	es listed on the app	propriate Surrogate Recovery Su	mmary Form?	X.		
7.2	Are surrogate	recoveries within	acceptance criteria specified in t	he QAPP for all samples?	N. XX	à l	
7.3	If No in Secti	on 7.2, were these	sample(s) or method blank(s) re	analyzed?			Х
7.4	If No in Sectiout.)	on 7.3, is any sam	ple dilution factor greater than 1	0? (Surrogate recoveries may	be diluted		x
	Note: If SMC recoveries do not meet acceptance criteria in samples chosen for the MS/MSD or diluted					-	
		> UCL	10% to LCL	< 10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			

Note: All surrogate recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

# 8.0 Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate (MS/MSD) or one MS with a Sample Duplicate (Recovery - Code M, RPD - Code D)

F		Yes	No	NA
8.1	Is a Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate recovery form present?	7.7.7	X	
8.2	Are MS/MSDs analyzed at the required frequency of one matrix spike per ten samples and a duplicate per twenty for each matrix?			x
8.3	Are all MS/MSD %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria Specified in the QAPP?	Contract		х
	Using informed professional judgment, the data reviewer should use the MS and MSD results in conjunction with other QC criteria and determine the need for qualification of the data for samples from the same site/matrix. Recoveries <10% may require rejection. RPD failures may be flagged "J" (+			

Note: MS/MSD samples were not submitted for analysis.

# 9.0 Laboratory Control Sample (LCS/LCSD) (Recovery - Code L, J - Code E)

	·	Yes	No	NA
9.1	Is an LCS recovery form present?	(A) X		
9.2	Is an LCS analyzed at the required frequency of one per twenty field samples for each matrix?	- X		
9.3	Are all LCS %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria specified in the QAPP?		X	
9.4	If Level IV, verify the % recoveries are calculated correctly.			х
	Action for specific compound outside the acceptance criteria: %R>UCL,			
	J(+) only; $<$ LCL, $J(+)/UJ(-)$ ; $<$ 30% $J(+)/R(-)$ . RPD failures should be flagged "J" (+ only)			

Note: The LCS for TO-15 Full Scan had a LCS recovery (171%) outside of evaluation criteria (70-130%). All associated samples were non-detect. No qualification of data was required.

# 10.0 Internal Standards (Code I)

					Yes	No	NA
10.1	Are internal stan	dard areas for every sample a	and blank within upper and	lower QC limits?	2 / X / (x)		
		Area > +100%	Area < -50%	Area < -10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			
Note:		sample to continuing calibrati formed professional judgmen					
10.2	Action: The chr shift of a large m	nes of internal standards with omatogram must be examine nagnitude, the reviewer may o	d to determine if any false p	ositives or negatives exist.			
	in that sample/fr	action.			1		

Note: Internal standard area counts and retention times were within evaluation criteria.

11.0 TCL Identification (Code W)			No	NA
11.1	Is the relative retention time (RRT) of each reported compound within 0.06 RRT units of the standard RRT in the continuing calibration?			х
11.2	Are the three ions of greatest intensity present in the standard mass spectrum also present in the sample mass spectrum; and do sample and standard relative ion intensities agree within 30%?			х

12.0 TCL/	FIC Quantitation and Reported Detection limits (Code K)	Yes	No	NA
12.1	Are RLs used consistent with those specified in the QAPP?	752033300		X
12.2	Are these limits adjusted to reflect dilutions and/ or percent solids as required?	26.5		х
12.3	Are TIC ions greater than ten percent in the reference spectrum also present in the sample spectrum?			х
12.4	Are any positives reported that exceed the linear range of the instrument? If yes, than flag "J".			X
12.5	If Level IV, calculate a sample of positive results to verify correct calculations			х
Note:			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

13.0 Field	Duplicate Samples (Code F)	Yes	No	NA
13.1	Were any field duplicates submitted for VOC analysis?	(4 <b>x</b> ******		
13.2	Were all RPD or absolute difference values within the control limits outlined in the QAPP?	<b>X</b> (*)		
	Action: No qualifying action is taken based on field duplicate results, however the data validator should			
	provide a qualitative assessment in the data validation report.			
Note:	Sample VI-11-A DUP was a field duplicate of sample VI-11-A			

# 14.0 Data Completeness

		Yes	No	NA
14.1	Is % completeness within the control limits? (Control limit: Check QAPP or use 95% for aqueo	ous 🔯 🗴	1	
14.2	Number of samples: 4			
14.3	Number of target compounds in each analysis: 60			
14.4	Number of results rejected and not reported: 0			
	% Completeness = $100 \times ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)$			
	% Completeness 100			

### DATA VALIDA ... JN WORKSHEET **VOLATILE ORGANIC ANALYSIS**

Reviewer:	Steve Gragert	Project Name:	Sauget - /	Area 2 Air	Sampling
Date:		Project Number:		61683.80	
Laboratory	Air Toxics	SDG No.:		0710035	
•		Review Level:		Level III	
Major Anom	olies:				
	No samples were rejected				
			,		
Minor Anom	olies:				
	No analytes required qualification	ased on this data review.			
			-		
Field IDs:	VI-10-B1				
	VI-10-C1				
	VI-6-B1				
	VI-6-C1				
1.0 Chain of	Custody/Sample Condition				
		Ī	Yes	No	NA
	In all is a control of		\$200 Section 1	<del></del>	<del></del>

		Yes	No	NA
1.1	Do Chain-of-Custody forms list all samples analyzed?	X		
1.2	Are all Chain-of-Custody forms signed, indicating sample chain-of-custody was maintained?	X,		
1.3	Do the Traffic Reports, chain-of-custody, and lab narrative indicate any problems with sample receipt,			
	condition of samples, analytical problems or special circumstances affecting the quality of the data?		C.X	

Note: No issues were noted in the laboratory case narrative or cooler receipt forms.

# 2.0 Holding Time/ Preservation (Code H)

		Yes	No	NA
2.1	Do sample preservation, collection and storage condition meet method requirement?	X		
	If sample preservation and/or temperature was inappropriate (i.e., <2°>6°C, etc.), comment in report. If unpreserved or temperature is outside the range 0° (but not frozen) to 10° flag all positive results with a "J" and all non-detects "UJ". If temperature exceeds 10°, flag positive detections "J" and non-detects "R".			
2.2	Have any technical holding times, determined from sampling to date of analysis, been exceeded? If yes, $J(+)/UJ(-)$ .		**************************************	
	Matrix Preserved Holding Time			
	Air No 14 days	1		
2.3	Have any technical holding times been grossly (twice the holding time) exceeded? If yes, J(+)/R(-).		XXX	

Note: All holding time criteria were met.

		Yes	No	NA
3.1	Are GC/MS Tuning and Mass Calibration forms present for bromofluorobenzene (BFB)?	7.21		Х
3.2	Have all samples been analyzed within twelve hours of the BFB tune? If no, flag R.			Х
3.3	Have ion abundance criteria for BFB been met for each instrument used? If no, flag R.	Pad.		х

Note:

#### 4.0 Blanks (Method Blanks, Field Blanks and Trip Blanks)

(Code X - Field Blank Contamination, Code Y - Trip blank contamination, Code Z - Method blank contamination)

		Yes	No	NA
4.1	Is a Method Blank Summary form present for each batch?	1 X 2		
4.2	Do any method blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		T.X	
4.3	Do any field/trip rinse/equipment blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		X	
	Action: Positive sample results <5X (or 10X for common volatile lab contaminants- methylene chloride, acetone, and 2-butanone) the blank concentration should be qualified "U". The result should be elevated to the RL for estimate (laboratory "J" flagged) concentrations.	1		
4.4	If Level IV, review raw data and verify all detections for blanks were reported.			х

Note: All blank criteria were met.

#### 5.0 GC/MS Initial Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
5.1	Are Initial Calibration summary forms present and complete for each instrument used?	4		X
5.2	Are CCCs linear applying either %RSD < 30% and all other compounds <15% or >0.990?	####.		Х
	If not, J(+)/ UJ(-). In extreme cases, the reviewer may flag non-detects "R".			
5.3	Do any SPCC compounds have an RRF less than specification or any other compounds < 0.05 (use 0.01		450	
	for poor responders like ketones or alcohols)? If yes, J(+)/R(-).	<u> </u>		x
5.4	Is the lowest standard at the same concentration, or lower, as the RL reported? If not, elevate RL.	\$36.5		X
5.5	If Level IV, recalculate a sample of RRFs and %RSDs to verify correct calculations are being made.			X

Note:

#### 6.0 Continuing Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
6.1	Are Continuing Calibration Summary forms present and complete?	*   * 0 * ± 0 *		х
6.2	Has a continuing calibration standard been analyzed every 12 hours?	<b>1988</b>		х
6.3	Have all SPCCs and CCCs met method specifications? If not, comment in report, proceed to 6.4.			х
6.4	Do any compounds have a % difference (or % drift for quantitation from a curve) (%D) between initial and continuing calibration RRF outside QC limits (%D < 20%)?			x
	If yes, a marginal increase in response >20% then $J(+)$ only; a decrease in response then $J(+)/UJ(-)$ . For %D > 50%, flag R.			
6.5	Do any compounds have an RRF < 0.05 (use 0.01 for poor responders)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$ .		200	х
6.6	If Level IV, calculate a sample of RFs and %Ds from ave RF to verify correct calculations.			х

#### 7.0 Surrogate Recovery (Code S)

						Yes	No	NA
7.1	Are all sampl	es listed on the app	propriate Surrogate Recovery Sur	mmary Form ?	1.	X		
7.2	Are surrogate	recoveries within	acceptance criteria specified in t	he QAPP for all samples?	3	·x.		
7.3	If No in Secti	on 7.2, were these	sample(s) or method blank(s) re	analyzed?				х
7.4	If No in Sectiout.)	on 7.3, is any sam	ole dilution factor greater than 1	0? (Surrogate recoveries may	be diluted			x
	Note: If SMC recoveries do not meet acceptance criteria in samples chosen for the MS/MSD or diluted							
		> UCL	10% to LCL	< 10%				
	Positive	J	j	J				
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R				

Note: All surrogate recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

#### 8.0 Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate (MS/MSD) or one MS with a Sample Duplicate (Recovery - Code M, RPD - Code D)

		Yes	No	NA
8.1	Is a Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate recovery form present?		х	
8.2	Are MS/MSDs analyzed at the required frequency of one matrix spike per ten samples and a duplicate per twenty for each matrix?			x
8.3	Are all MS/MSD %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria Specified in the QAPP?	1992		Х
	Using informed professional judgment, the data reviewer should use the MS and MSD results in conjunction with other QC criteria and determine the need for qualification of the data for samples from the same site/matrix. Recoveries <10% may require rejection. RPD failures may be flagged "J" (+			

Note: MS/MSD samples were not submitted for analysis.

#### 9.0 Laboratory Control Sample (LCS/LCSD) (Recovery - Code L, RPD - Code E)

			Yes	No	NA
	9.1	Is an LCS recovery form present?	X		
	9.2	Is an LCS analyzed at the required frequency of one per twenty field samples for each matrix?	\$ X 0		
	9.3	Are all LCS %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria specified in the QAPP?	# X 2.77		
	9.4	If Level IV, verify the % recoveries are calculated correctly.			x
Г		Action for specific compound outside the accéptance criteria: %R>UCL,			
L		J(+) only; $<$ LCL, $J(+)/UJ(-)$ ; $<$ 30% $J(+)/R(-)$ . RPD failures should be flagged "J" (+ only)			

Note: All LCS recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

#### 10.0 Internal Standards (Code I)

					Yes	No	NA
10.1	Are internal stan	dard areas for every sample a	and blank within upper and	lower QC limits?	1.5% X		
		Area > +100%	Area < -50%	Area < -10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			•
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			
Note:	The method spec	ification is for the continuing	g calibration to be compared	I to the mid-point initial			
10.2	Are retention tim	nes of internal standards with	in 30 seconds of the associa	ted calibration standard?	X		
	Action: The chr	For					

Note: Internal standard area counts and retention times were within evaluation criteria.

11.0 TCL Id	lentification (Code W)	Yes	No	NA
11.1	Is the relative retention time (RRT) of each reported compound within 0.06 RRT units of the standard			
	RRT in the continuing calibration?			x
11.2	Are the three ions of greatest intensity present in the standard mass spectrum also present in the sample	124		1
	mass spectrum; and do sample and standard relative ion intensities agree within 30%?			<u>x</u>

Note:

12.0 TCL/	TIC Quantitation and Reported Detection limits (Code K)	Yes	No	NA
12.1	Are RLs used consistent with those specified in the QAPP?	対数を分割		Х
12.2	Are these limits adjusted to reflect dilutions and/ or percent solids as required?			X
12.3	Are TIC ions greater than ten percent in the reference spectrum also present in the sample spectrum?	(F-1)		Х
12.4	Are any positives reported that exceed the linear range of the instrument? If yes, than flag "J".		STATE NO.	X
12.5	If Level IV, calculate a sample of positive results to verify correct calculations			х

Note:

1	3.0 Field D	·			NA
	13.1	Were any field duplicates submitted for VOC analysis?	3/23/25	х	
	13.2	Were all RPD or absolute difference values within the control limits outlined in the QAPP?	100		х
$\Gamma$		Action: No qualifying action is taken based on field duplicate results, however the data validator should			
L		provide a qualitative assessment in the data validation report.			

Note: Field duplicate samples were not submitted for analysis.

# 14.0 Data Completeness

		Yes	No	NA
14.1	Is % completeness within the control limits? (Control limit: Check QAPP or use 95% for aqueous	<b>编版文字</b>		Ī
14.2	Number of samples: 4			
14.3	Number of target compounds in each analysis: 60			
14.4	Number of results rejected and not reported: 0			
	% Completeness = 100 x ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)			
	% Completeness 100			

# DATA VALID. JN WORKSHEET VOLATILE ORGANIC ANALYSIS

Reviewer:	Steve Gragert Project Name:	Sauget - /	Area 2 Air S	Sampling
Date:	11/15/2007 Project Number:			012
Laboratory	Air Toxics SDG No.:			
	Review Level:		Level III	
Major Anom	plies:			
	No samples were rejected			_
Minor Anom	nlies:			
	No analytes required qualification based on this data review.			
	110 analytes required quantification cused on any data review.			
Field IDs:	VI-9-A			
rielu IDs.				
	VI-9-B			
	VI-9-C			
	VI-8-C			
1.0 Chain of	Custody/Sample Condition	· *,		
		Yes	No	NA
1.1	Do Chain-of-Custody forms list all samples analyzed?	X	<b></b>	
1.2	Are all Chain-of-Custody forms signed, indicating sample chain-of-custody was maintained?	X		
1.3	Do the Traffic Reports, chain-of-custody, and lab narrative indicate any problems with sample receipt,			
	condition of samples, analytical problems or special circumstances affecting the quality of the data?	l	X	
Note:	No issues were noted in the laboratory case narrative or cooler receipt forms.			
				·
2.0 Holding	Time/ Preservation (Code H)			
		Yes	No	NA
2.1	Do sample preservation, collection and storage condition meet method requirement?	X X		
<del> </del>	Do sample preservation, collection and storage condition meet method requirement?  It sample preservation and/or temperature was inappropriate (i.e., <2°>6°C, etc.), comment in report. It	3.5.5.	·	
	unpreserved or temperature is outside the range 0° (but not frozen) to 10° flag all positive results with a			
	"J" and all non-detects "UJ". If temperature exceeds 10°, flag positive detections "J" and non-detects			
2.2	"R" Have any technical holding times, determined from sampling to date of analysis, been exceeded? If yes,	<del> </del> -	3545,4205530	
2.2	J(+)/UJ(-).			
	Matrix Preserved Holding Time	<del>                                     </del>	#########\$\$\$\$	<del></del> .
	Air No 14 days	1		
2.3	Have any technical holding times been grossly (twice the holding time) exceeded? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$ .	<del> </del>	X	
Note:	All holding time criteria were met.		290460 T. T. T.	

## 3.0 GC/MS Instrument Performance Check (Code T)

		Yes_	· No	NA
3.1	Are GC/MS Tuning and Mass Calibration forms present for bromofluorobenzene (BFB)?	77.77		х
3.2	Have all samples been analyzed within twelve hours of the BFB tune? If no, flag R.	7421-074		x
3.3	Have ion abundance criteria for BFB been met for each instrument used? If no, flag R.			x

Note:

#### 4.0 Blanks (Method Blanks, Field Blanks and Trip Blanks)

(Code X - Field Blank Contamination, Code Y - Trip blank contamination, Code Z - Method blank contamination)

		Yes	No	NA
4.1	Is a Method Blank Summary form present for each batch?	X		
4.2	Do any method blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		X	
4.3	Do any field/trip rinse/equipment blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?			х
	Action: Positive sample results <5X (or 10X for common volatile lab contaminants- methylene chloride, acetone, and 2-butanone) the blank concentration should be qualified "U". The result should be elevated to the RL for estimate (laboratory "J" flagged) concentrations.	I .		
4.4	If Level IV, review raw data and verify all detections for blanks were reported.			х

Note: All blank criteria were met.

#### 5.0 GC/MS Initial Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
5.1	Are Initial Calibration summary forms present and complete for each instrument used?			х
5.2	Are CCCs linear applying either %RSD < 30% and all other compounds <15% or >0.990?	7		Х
	If not, J(+)/ UJ(-). In extreme cases, the reviewer may flag non-detects "R".			
5.3	Do any SPCC compounds have an RRF less than specification or any other compounds < 0.05 (use 0.01			
	for poor responders like ketones or alcohols)? If yes, J(+)/R(-).			x
5.4	Is the lowest standard at the same concentration, or lower, as the RL reported? If not, elevate RL.	*600		х
5.5	If Level IV, recalculate a sample of RRFs and %RSDs to verify correct calculations are being made.			х

Note:

# 6.0 Continuing Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	. NA
6.1	Are Continuing Calibration Summary forms present and complete?			x
6.2	Has a continuing calibration standard been analyzed every 12 hours?	200		x
_ 6.3	Have all SPCCs and CCCs met method specifications? If not, comment in report, proceed to 6.4.			х
6.4	Do any compounds have a % difference (or % drift for quantitation from a curve) (%D) between initial and continuing calibration RRF outside QC limits (%D < 20%)?			x
	If yes, a marginal increase in response >20% then $J(+)$ only; a decrease in response then $J(+)/UJ(-)$ . For $\%D > 50\%$ , flag R.			
6.5	Do any compounds have an RRF < 0.05 (use 0.01 for poor responders)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$ .		Pro Fall	x
6.6	If Level IV, calculate a sample of RFs and %Ds from ave RF to verify correct calculations.			х

Note:

## 7.0 Surrogate Recovery (Code S)

					Yes	No	NA
7.1	Are all sampl	es listed on the app	propriate Surrogate Recovery Su	mmary Form ?	₹. <b>X</b>		
7.2	Are surrogate	recoveries within	acceptance criteria specified in t	he QAPP for all samples?	X, H	No.	
7.3	If No in Secti	on 7.2, were these	sample(s) or method blank(s) re	analyzed?			х
7.4	If No in Sectiout.)	on 7.3, is any sam	ple dilution factor greater than 1	O? (Surrogate recoveries may	be diluted		x
	Note: If SMO	recoveries do not	meet acceptance criteria in sam	ples chosen for the MS/MSD of	or diluted		
		> UCL	10% to LCL	< 10%			
	Positiv <b>e</b>	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R		_	

Note: All surrogate recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

## 8.0 Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate (MS/MSD) or one MS with a Sample Duplicate (Recovery - Code M, RPD - Code D)

		Yes	No	NA
8.1	Is a Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate recovery form present?		х	
8.2	Are MS/MSDs analyzed at the required frequency of one matrix spike per ten samples and a duplicate per twenty for each matrix?			x
8.3	Are all MS/MSD %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria Specified in the QAPP?	<b>*</b> *******		х
	Using informed professional judgment, the data reviewer should use the MS and MSD results in conjunction with other QC criteria and determine the need for qualification of the data for samples from the same site/matrix. Recoveries <10% may require rejection. RPD failures may be flagged "J" (+			

Note: MS/MSD samples were not submitted for analysis.

## 9.0 Laboratory Control Sample (LCS/LCSD) (Recovery - Code L, RPD - Code E)

		Yes	No	NA
9.1	Is an LCS recovery form present?	X.		
9.2	Is an LCS analyzed at the required frequency of one per twenty field samples for each matrix?	X 3		
9.3	Are all LCS %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria specified in the QAPP?	<b>X</b>		
9.4	If Level IV, verify the % recoveries are calculated correctly.			Х
	Action for specific compound outside the acceptance criteria: %R>UCL,			
	J(+) only; $<$ LCL, $J(+)/UJ(-)$ ; $<$ 30% $J(+)/R(-)$ . RPD failures should be flagged "J" (+ only)			

Note: All LCS recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

## 10.0 Internal Standards (Code I)

					Yes	No	NA
10.1	Are internal star	ndard areas for every sample a	and blank within upper and	lower QC limits?	X		
		Area > +100%	Area < -50%	Area < -10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			
Note:		sample to continuing calibrati iformed professional judgmen			oles in		
10.2	Action: The chr	nes of internal standards with romatogram must be examine nagnitude, the reviewer may of raction.	ed to determine if any false p	ositives or negatives exist.	ı		

Note: Internal standard area counts and retention times were within evaluation criteria.

11.0 TCL Identification (Code W)		Yes	No	NA
li	Is the relative retention time (RRT) of each reported compound within 0.06 RRT units of the standard RRT in the continuing calibration?			х
11	Are the three ions of greatest intensity present in the standard mass spectrum also present in the sample mass spectrum; and do sample and standard relative ion intensities agree within 30%?			х

Note:

12.0 TCL/	TIC Quantitation and Reported Detection limits (Code K)	Yes	No	NA
12.1	Are RLs used consistent with those specified in the QAPP?	100		X
12.2	Are these limits adjusted to reflect dilutions and/ or percent solids as required?	(4)		х
12.3	Are TIC ions greater than ten percent in the reference spectrum also present in the sample spectrum?	40.50		х
12.4	Are any positives reported that exceed the linear range of the instrument? If yes, than flag "J".		ST 25 E	х
12.5	If Level IV, calculate a sample of positive results to verify correct calculations			х

Note:

13.0 Field I	Duplicate Samples (Code F)	Yes	No	NA
13.1	Were any field duplicates submitted for VOC analysis?	36%、海红	X	
13.2	Were all RPD or absolute difference values within the control limits outlined in the QAPP?	Sec. Carr		X
	Action: No qualifying action is taken based on field duplicate results, however the data validator should			
	provide a qualitative assessment in the data validation report.			

Note: Field duplicate samples were not submitted for analysis.

## 14.0 Data Completeness

			Yes	No	NA
14.1	Is % completeness within the control limits? (Control limit: Check QAPF	or use 95% for aqueous	经间 <b>X</b>		
14.2	Number of samples:	4			
14.3	Number of target compounds in each analysis:	60			
14.4	Number of results rejected and not reported:	0 _			
	% Completeness = $100 \times ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)$		$\Box$		
	% Completeness	100	$\neg$		

# DATA VALID. JN WORKSHEET VOLATILE ORGANIC ANALYSIS

Reviewer:	Steve Gragert				Project Name:	Sauget -	Area 2 Air	Sampling
Date:	11/15/2007	•			Project Number:	215	61683.80	012
Laboratory	Air Toxics	•			SDG No.:		0710169	
·		•			Review Level:		Level III	
Major Anom	olies:							
•	No samples were rejected							
		<del></del>						
Minor Anom	olies:							
.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	No analytes required qualification	hased on this data re-	view					
	Tto analytes required quarrication	based on this data re	view.	<u> </u>				
					<del></del>			
Field IDs:	VI-7-B	<u> </u>	VI-7-A					
· ·	VI-7-C		VI-8-A					
	VI-7-C DUP		VI-7-D					
•	VI-7-C DUP	<u> </u>	VI-7-D					
1 0 Chain of	Custody/Sample Condition					`		
1.0 Cham of	Custody/Sample Condition					Yes	No	NA
1,1	Do Chain-of-Custody forms	list all samples ar	nalvzed?		···	X		
1.2	Are all Chain-of-Custody for			in-of-custody w	as maintained?	. X		
1.3	Do the Traffic Reports, chair							
	condition of samples, analyti						X	
Note:	No issues were noted in the labora					<del>'</del>	<u> </u>	
14010.	TWO ISSUES WELC HOTED IN THE PADOLA	nory case narrative of	cooler receipt fort	115.		<del></del>		
2.0 Holding	Time/ Preservation (Code H	I)						
210 110101119		- <b>-</b>				Yes	No	NA
2.1	Do sample preservation, coll	ection and storage	a condition made	mothod require	ment?	X		
	If sample preservation and/or							L
	unpreserved or temperature i							
	"J" and all non-detects "UJ".							
	"R".		needdo 10 , mag					
2.2	Have any technical holding t	imes, determined	from sampling	to date of analys	sis, been exceeded? If yes,			
(	J(+)/UJ(-).		. 0	•			X	
	Matrix Pre	eserved	Holding Tir	ne				

2.3 Note:

All holding time criteria were met.

No

Air

Lat FX design

14 days

Have any technical holding times been grossly (twice the holding time) exceeded? If yes, J(+)/R(-).

## 3.0 GC/MS Instrument Performance Check (Code T)

		Yes	No	NA
3.1	Are GC/MS Tuning and Mass Calibration forms present for bromofluorobenzene (BFB)?	**************************************		x
3.2	Have all samples been analyzed within twelve hours of the BFB tune? If no, flag R.			x
3.3	Have ion abundance criteria for BFB been met for each instrument used? If no, flag R.	9.75.274		x

Note:

#### 4.0 Blanks (Method Blanks, Field Blanks and Trip Blanks)

(Code X - Field Blank Contamination, Code Y - Trip blank contamination, Code Z - Method blank contamination)

		Yes	No	NA
4.1	Is a Method Blank Summary form present for each batch?	X		••
4.2	Do any method blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		X	
4.3	Do any field/trip rinse/equipment blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		X	
	Action: Positive sample results <5X (or 10X for common volatile lab contaminants- methylene chloride, acetone, and 2-butanone) the blank concentration should be qualified "U". The result should be elevated			
4.4	to the RL for estimate (laboratory "J" flagged) concentrations.  If Level IV, review raw data and verify all detections for blanks were reported.			X

Note: All blank criteria were met.

## 5.0 GC/MS Initial Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA.
5.1	Are Initial Calibration summary forms present and complete for each instrument used?	77.44		X
5.2	Are CCCs linear applying either %RSD < 30% and all other compounds <15% or >0.990?	4-m 450		x
	If not, J(+)/ UJ(-). In extreme cases, the reviewer may flag non-detects "R".			
5.3	Do any SPCC compounds have an RRF less than specification or any other compounds < 0.05 (use 0.01			
	for poor responders like ketones or alcohols)? If yes, J(+)/R(-).	1		X
5.4	Is the lowest standard at the same concentration, or lower, as the RL reported? If not, elevate RL.	1.00		х
5.5	If Level IV, recalculate a sample of RRFs and %RSDs to verify correct calculations are being made.			X

Note:

# 6.0 Continuing Calibration (Code C)

	Yes	No	NA
Are Continuing Calibration Summary forms present and complete?	Contract to the		x
Has a continuing calibration standard been analyzed every 12 hours?			x_
Have all SPCCs and CCCs met method specifications? If not, comment in report, proceed to 6.4.			x
Do any compounds have a % difference (or % drift for quantitation from a curve) (%D) between initial and continuing calibration RRF outside QC limits (%D < 20%)?			x
If yes, a marginal increase in response >20% then $J(+)$ only; a decrease in response then $J(+)/UJ(-)$ . For %D > 50%, flag R.			
Do any compounds have an RRF < 0.05 (use 0.01 for poor responders)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$ .		<b>EX</b> 222	х
If Level IV, calculate a sample of RFs and %Ds from ave RF to verify correct calculations.			х
	Has a continuing calibration standard been analyzed every 12 hours?  Have all SPCCs and CCCs met method specifications? If not, comment in report, proceed to 6.4.  Do any compounds have a % difference (or % drift for quantitation from a curve) (%D) between initial and continuing calibration RRF outside QC limits (%D < 20%)?  If yes, a marginal increase in response >20% then J(+) only; a decrease in response then J(+)/ UJ(-). For %D > 50%, flag R.  Do any compounds have an RRF < 0.05 (use 0.01 for poor responders)? If yes, J(+)/R(-).	Are Continuing Calibration Summary forms present and complete?  Has a continuing calibration standard been analyzed every 12 hours?  Have all SPCCs and CCCs met method specifications? If not, comment in report, proceed to 6.4.  Do any compounds have a % difference (or % drift for quantitation from a curve) (%D) between initial and continuing calibration RRF outside QC limits (%D < 20%)?  If yes, a marginal increase in response >20% then J(+) only; a decrease in response then J(+)/ UJ(-). For %D > 50%, flag R.  Do any compounds have an RRF < 0.05 (use 0.01 for poor responders)? If yes, J(+)/R(-).	Are Continuing Calibration Summary forms present and complete?  Has a continuing calibration standard been analyzed every 12 hours?  Have all SPCCs and CCCs met method specifications? If not, comment in report, proceed to 6.4.  Do any compounds have a % difference (or % drift for quantitation from a curve) (%D) between initial and continuing calibration RRF outside QC limits (%D < 20%)?  If yes, a marginal increase in response >20% then J(+) only; a decrease in response then J(+)/ UJ(-). For %D > 50%, flag R.  Do any compounds have an RRF < 0.05 (use 0.01 for poor responders)? If yes, J(+)/R(-).

Note:

## 7.0 Surrogate Recovery (Code S)

					Yes	No	NA
7.1	Are all sampl	es listed on the app	propriate Surrogate Recovery Sur	mmary Form ?	ill hix		
7.2	Are surrogate	recoveries within	acceptance criteria specified in t	he QAPP for all samples?	₩. in		
7.3	If No in Secti	on 7.2, were these	sample(s) or method blank(s) re	analyzed?			х
7.4	If No in Secti out.)	on 7.3, is any samp	ole dilution factor greater than 10	0? (Surrogate recoveries may	be diluted		x
	Note: If SMC	recoveries do not	meet acceptance criteria in sam	ples chosen for the MS/MSD	or diluted		
		> UCL	10% to LCL	< 10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			

Note: All surrogate recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

## 8.0 Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate (MS/MSD) or one MS with a Sample Duplicate (Recovery - Code M, RPD - Code D)

		Yes	No	NA
8.1	Is a Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate recovery form present?		X	
8.2	Are MS/MSDs analyzed at the required frequency of one matrix spike per ten samples and a duplicate per twenty for each matrix?			x
8.3	Are all MS/MSD %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria Specified in the QAPP?	<b>4</b> 3.77		X
_	Using informed professional judgment, the data reviewer should use the MS and MSD results in conjunction with other QC criteria and determine the need for qualification of the data for samples from the same site/matrix. Recoveries <10% may require rejection. RPD failures may be flagged "J" (+			

Note: MS/MSD samples were not submitted for analysis.

## 9.0 Laboratory Control Sample (LCS/LCSD) (Recovery - Code L, RPD - Code E)

			Yes	No	NA
	9.1	Is an LCS recovery form present?	20 X 12		
	9.2	Is an LCS analyzed at the required frequency of one per twenty field samples for each matrix?	Salata.		
	9.3	Are all LCS %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria specified in the QAPP?	No.		
L	9.4	If Level IV, verify the % recoveries are calculated correctly.			х
		Action for specific compound outside the acceptance criteria: %R>UCL,			
L		J(+) only; $<$ LCL, $J(+)/UJ(-)$ ; $<$ 30% $J(+)/R(-)$ . RPD failures should be flagged "J" (+ only)			

Note: All LCS recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

## 10.0 Internal Standards (Code I)

					Yes	No	NA
10.1	Are internal stan	dard areas for every sample	and blank within upper and	lower QC limits?	X		
		Area > +100%	Area < -50%	Area < -10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			
Note:		sample to continuing calibrat formed professional judgmer					
10.2	Action: The chr	nes of internal standards with comatogram must be examine nagnitude, the reviewer may o	d to determine if any false p	ositives or negatives exist.			
	in that sample/fr	raction.					

Note: Internal standard area counts and retention times were within evaluation criteria.

11.0 TCL Id	lentification (Code W)	Yes	No	NA
11	Is the relative retention time (RRT) of each reported compound within 0.06 RRT units of the standard RRT in the continuing calibration?			х
8	Are the three ions of greatest intensity present in the standard mass spectrum also present in the sample mass spectrum; and do sample and standard relative ion intensities agree within 30%?			х

Note:

12.0 TCI	L/TIC Quantitation and Reported Detection limits (Code K)	Yes	No	NA
12.1	Are RLs used consistent with those specified in the QAPP?	S		Х
12.2	Are these limits adjusted to reflect dilutions and/ or percent solids as required?	METAL		х
12.3	Are TIC ions greater than ten percent in the reference spectrum also present in the sample spectrum?	778-24		Х
12.4	Are any positives reported that exceed the linear range of the instrument? If yes, than flag "J".			X

12.5 Note:

Field I	Duplicate Samples (Code F)	Yes	No	NA
13.1	Were any field duplicates submitted for VOC analysis?	X-		<u> </u>
13.2	Were all RPD or absolute difference values within the control limits outlined in the QAPP?	X		
	Action: No qualifying action is taken based on field duplicate results, however the data validator should		·	
	provide a qualitative assessment in the data validation report.			

Note: Sample VI-7-C DUP was a field duplicate of sample VI-7-C. Both samples were analyzed for TO-15 Full Scan and Oxygen.

If Level IV, calculate a sample of positive results to verify correct calculations

## 14.0 Data Completeness

		Yes	No_	NA
Is % completeness within the control limits? (Control limit: Check QAP	P or use 95% for aqueous	WAX ALE		
Number of samples:	6			
Number of target compounds in each analysis:	60			
Number of results rejected and not reported:	0			
% Completeness = $100 \times ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)$		$\neg$		
% Completeness	100			
	Number of samples:  Number of target compounds in each analysis:  Number of results rejected and not reported:  % Completeness = 100 x ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)	Number of target compounds in each analysis:  Number of results rejected and not reported:  % Completeness = 100 x ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)	Number of samples:  Number of target compounds in each analysis:  Number of results rejected and not reported:  Completeness = 100 x ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)	Is % completeness within the control limits? (Control limit: Check QAPP or use 95% for aqueous Number of samples:    Number of target compounds in each analysis: 60

9/4/2008

X

# DATA VALID. JN WORKSHEET VOLATILE ORGANIC ANALYSIS

Reviewer:	Steve Gragert Project Name:	Sauget -	Area 2 Air	Sampling
Date:		215	61683.80	012
Laboratory	Air Toxics SDG No.:		0709576	
•	Review Level:		Level IV	
Major Anom	olies;			
-	No samples were rejected			
				-
				<del> </del>
Minor Anom	olies:			
	Samples were qualified "J/UJ" due to Initial and Continuing Calibration %RSDs and %Ds outside of evaluation criteria.			
				=
Field IDs:	VI-10-A			
	VI-6-A			
	VI-12-A			
1.0 Chain of	Custody/Sample Condition			
		Yes	No	NA
1.1	Do Chain-of-Custody forms list all samples analyzed?	<b>X</b>		
1.2	Are all Chain-of-Custody forms signed, indicating sample chain-of-custody was maintained?	X		
1.3	Do the Traffic Reports, chain-of-custody, and lab narrative indicate any problems with sample receipt,			
	condition of samples, analytical problems or special circumstances affecting the quality of the data?		7.	i
Note:	The laboratory case narrative and cooler receipt form did not indicate any problems.			_
******				
2.0 Holding	Time/ Preservation (Code H)			
_		Yes	No	NA
2.1	Do sample preservation, collection and storage condition meet method requirement?	· x		
	If sample preservation and/or temperature was inappropriate (i.e., <2° >6°C, etc.), comment in report. If		·	
	unpreserved or temperature is outside the range 0° (but not frozen) to 10° flag all positive results with a	İ		
	"J" and all non-detects "UJ". If temperature exceeds 10°, flag positive detections "J" and non-detects	İ		
	"R".			
2.2	Have any technical holding times, determined from sampling to date of analysis, been exceeded? If yes,			
	J(+)/UJ(-).		X	
	Matrix Preserved Holding Time			
	Air No .14 days			
2.3	Have any technical holding times been grossly (twice the holding time) exceeded? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$ .		X	
Note:	All holding time criteria were met.			

#### 3.0 GC/MS Instrument Performance Check (Code T)

<u> </u>		Yes	No	NA
3.1	Are GC/MS Tuning and Mass Calibration forms present for bromofluorobenzene (BFB)?	<b>***</b> *********************************		
3.2	Have all samples been analyzed within twelve hours of the BFB tune? If no, flag R.	X		
3.3	Have ion abundance criteria for BFB been met for each instrument used? If no, flag R.	<b>X X X X X X X X X X</b>		

Note: All instrument performance check criteria were met.

#### 4.0 Blanks (Method Blanks, Field Blanks and Trip Blanks)

(Code X - Field Blank Contamination, Code Y - Trip blank contamination, Code Z - Method blank contamination)

			Yes	No	NA
4	. 1	Is a Method Blank Summary form present for each batch?	XA.		
4	.2	Do any method blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		X	
4	.3	Do any field/trip rinse/equipment blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		经主义数	X
		Action: Positive sample results <5X (or 10X for common volatile lab contaminants- methylene chloride, acetone, and 2-butanone) the blank concentration should be qualified "U". The result should be elevated to the RL for estimate (laboratory "J" flagged) concentrations.	ı		
4	.4	If Level IV, review raw data and verify all detections for blanks were reported.	х		

Note: All blank criteria were met.

## 5.0 GC/MS Initial Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
5.	Are Initial Calibration summary forms present and complete for each instrument used?	u Krist		
5.:	Are CCCs linear applying either %RSD < 30% and all other compounds <30% or >0.990?	7 F 79 39	х	
	If not, J(+)/ UJ(-). In extreme cases, the reviewer may flag non-detects "R".			
5.:	Do any SPCC compounds have an RRF less than specification or any other compounds < 0.05 (use 0.01)			
	for poor responders like ketones or alcohols)? If yes, J(+)/R(-).		<b>1</b> -4 <b>X</b> - 1	
5.4	Is the lowest standard at the same concentration, or lower, as the RL reported? If not, elevate RL.	<b>X</b>		
5.,	If Level IV, recalculate a sample of RRFs and %RSDs to verify correct calculations are being made.	X		

Note: For TO-15 Full Scan, all analytes had a %RSD < 30%, with the exception of 1,2-Dichlorobenzene (31%) in data package 0709576A,

alpha-Chlorotoluene and MTBE (38%) in data package 0709576D, Qualifications based on ICAL %RSD are located in the table below:

Field ID	Analyte(s)	· Qualification	Code:	Batch # Date 4	Justification Justification
VI-12-A	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	J	С	t1410921b	ICAL %RSD >30%
VI-10-A	alpha-Chiorotoluene	UJ	С	t14q928b	ICAL %RSD >30%
VI-10-A	Methyl tert-butyl ether	UJ	С	t14q928b	ICAL %RSD >30%
VI-6-A_	alpha-Chlorotoluene	UJ	С	t14q928b	ICAL %RSD >30%
VI-6-A	Methyl tert-butyl ether	UJ	С	t14q928b	ICAL %RSD >30%

#### 6.0 Continuing Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
6.1	Are Continuing Calibration Summary forms present and complete?	X		
6.2	Has a continuing calibration standard been analyzed every 12 hours?	X		
6.3	Have all SPCCs and CCCs met method specifications? If not, comment in report, proceed to 6.4.	$r = \mathbf{X}_1$		
6.4	Do any compounds have a % difference (or % drift for quantitation from a curve) (%D) between initial and continuing calibration RRF outside QC limits (%D <30%)?	x		
	If yes, a marginal increase in response >30% then $J(+)$ only; a decrease in response then $J(+)/UJ(-)$ . For %D > 50%, flag R.			
6.5	Do any compounds have an RRF < 0.05 (use 0.01 for poor responders)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$ .		X	
6.6	If Level IV, calculate a sample of RFs and %Ds from ave RF to verify correct calculations.	х		

Note:

For TO-15 Full Scan, all analytes had a %D < 30%, with the exception of Ethanol (40%) and Methyl tert-butyl ether (33%) for data package 0709576A. In data package 0709576D, 2-Butanone (33%) and alpha-Chlorotoluene (36%) had %D > 30%. Qualifications based on CCAL %D are located in the table below. The compound alpha-chlorotoluene was previously qualified due to initial calibration in

samples VI-10-A and VI-6-A, no additional qualification of data was required.

Field ID	Analyte(s)	Qualification	Code F. L. Code	March # 30	Justification
VI-12-A	Ethanol	UJ	·C	t1410921b	CCAL %D >30%
VI-12-A	Methyl tert-butyl ether	UJ	С	t14l0921b	CCAL %D >30%
VI-10-A	2-Butanone	J	С	114q928b	CCAL %D >30%
VI-6-A	2-Butanone	UJ	C	t14q928b	CCAL %D >30%

## 7.0 Surrogate Recovery (Code S)

			·		Yes	No	NA
7.1	Are all sampl	les listed on the app	propriate Surrogate Recovery Su	mmary Form ?	(cf. <b>X</b> <sup>2</sup> /2)		
7.2	Are surrogate	recoveries within	acceptance criteria specified in t	he QAPP for all samples?	X		
7.3	If No in Secti	ion 7.2, were these	sample(s) or method blank(s) re	analyzed?			x
7.4	If No in Section 7.3, is any sample dilution factor greater than 10? (Surrogate recoveries may be diluted out.)						x
	Note: If SM	C recoveries do not	meet acceptance criteria in sam	ples chosen for the MS/MSD	or diluted		
		> UCL	10% to LCL	< 10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			

Note:

All surrogate recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

#### 8.0 Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate (MS/MSD) or one MS with a Sample Duplicate (Recovery - Code M, RPD - Code D)

		Yes	No	NA
8.1	Is a Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate recovery form present?			х
8.2	Are MS/MSDs analyzed at the required frequency of one matrix spike per ten samples and a duplicate per twenty for each matrix?			x
8.3	Are all MS/MSD %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria Specified in the QAPP?	2500.00		х
	Using informed professional judgment, the data reviewer should use the MS and MSD results in conjunction with other QC criteria and determine the need for qualification of the data for samples from the same site/matrix. Recoveries <10% may require rejection. RPD failures may be flagged "J" (+			

Note:

MS/MSD samples were not submitted for analysis.

## 9.0 Laboratory Control Sample (LCS/LCSD) (Recovery - Code L, O - Code E)

		Yes	No	NA_
9.1	Is an LCS recovery form present?	* X		
9.2	Is an LCS analyzed at the required frequency of one per twenty field samples for each matrix?	W.X.		
9.3	Are all LCS %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria specified in the QAPP?	X		
9.4	If Level IV, verify the % recoveries are calculated correctly.	x		
	Action for specific compound outside the acceptance criteria: %R>UCL,			
	J(+) only; $<$ LCL, $J(+)/UJ(-)$ ; $<$ 30% $J(+)/R(-)$ . RPD failures should be flagged "J" (+ only)			

Note: All LCS recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

## 10.0 Internal Standards (Code I)

					Y	es	No	NA
10.1 Note:	Are internal standard areas for every sample and blank within upper and lower QC limits?					13.14		
		Area > +100%	Area < -50%	Area < -10%				
	Positive	J	J	J				
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R				
Note:	1	calibration, not sample to continuing calibration. Thus, if all other QC specifications are met for a given sample, using informed professional judgment, the reviewer may choose not to flag individual samples in						
10.2		nes of internal standards with						
		omatogram must be examine nagnitude, the reviewer may o action.						

Note: Internal standard area counts and retention times were within evaluation criteria.

11.0 TCL Identification (Code W)		Yes	No	NA
11.1	Is the relative retention time (RRT) of each reported compound within 0.06 RRT units of the standard RRT in the continuing calibration?	x		
11.2	Are the three ions of greatest intensity present in the standard mass spectrum also present in the sample mass spectrum; and do sample and standard relative ion intensities agree within 30%?	X		

Note: All criteria were met.

12.0 TCL/	TIC Quantitation and Reported Detection limits (Code K)	Yes	No	NA
12.1	Are RLs used consistent with those specified in the QAPP?	X T		
12.2	Are these limits adjusted to reflect dilutions and/ or percent solids as required?	X		
12.3	Are TIC ions greater than ten percent in the reference spectrum also present in the sample spectrum?			х
12.4	Are any positives reported that exceed the linear range of the instrument? If yes, than flag "J".		X.	
12.5	If Level IV, calculate a sample of positive results to verify correct calculations			

Note: All criteria were met.

13.0 Field I	Duplicate Samples (Code F)	Yes	No	NA
13.1	Were any field duplicates submitted for VOC analysis?		Х	
13.2	Were all RPD or absolute difference values within the control limits outlined in the QAPP?	なる。		х
	Action: No qualifying action is taken based on field duplicate results, however the data validator should			
	provide a qualitative assessment in the data validation report.			
Note:	Field duplicate samples were not submitted for analysis.			

# 14.0 Data Completeness

	Yes	No	NA
Is % completeness within the control limits? (Control limit: Check QAPP or use 95% for aqueous	7 X X		
Number of samples: 3			
Number of target compounds in each analysis: 60			
Number of results rejected and not reported: 0			
% Completeness = 100 x ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)			
% Completeness 100			
	Number of samples:  Number of target compounds in each analysis:  Number of results rejected and not reported:  Completeness = 100 x ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)	Is % completeness within the control limits? (Control limit: Check QAPP or use 95% for aqueous  Number of samples:  Number of target compounds in each analysis:  Number of results rejected and not reported:  % Completeness = 100 x ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)	Is % completeness within the control limits? (Control limit: Check QAPP or use 95% for aqueous  Number of samples:  Number of target compounds in each analysis:  Number of results rejected and not reported:  % Completeness = 100 x ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)

Note